This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

A 476610

J. S. J. Hawkins
June 16 1926



MEMOIRS

OF

HER MAJESTY

QUEEN CAROLINE AMELIA ELIZ.

CONSORT OF GEORGE IV.

KING OF GREAT BRITAIN.

By JOHN WILKS, Jun.

Veritas nihil veretur nisi abscondi. Ter.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR SHERWOOD, NEELY, AND JONES,

PATERNOSTER ROW.

1822.

DA
538
.A2
W69
v.2

13-252033

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS RELATIVE TO THE TRIAL OF THE QUEEN—AND CHARACTER OF WITNESSES—TABULAR ANALYSIS OF TRIAL—AND ULTERIOR PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS TO THE WITHDRAWMENT OF THE BILL OF PAINS AND PENALTIES—PRIVATE HISTORY OF HER MAJESTY TO THAT PERIOD.

THE trial of the Queen for alleged adultery was the most important event in her life, whether her personal interest was considered, or the effects which such a measure must necessarily produce on the laws and liberties of the country. Reports of the trial, professedly verbatim, have been published by various persons, and it would be mere book-making to transcribe them into the present work. An Analysis of the trial will be hereafter presented, which will contain the substance of the charges and defence, in a perspicuous and tabular arrangement. The first column will include the charges brought against the Queen, nearly the whole of which are from the Attorney-General's speech, and as much as possible in his own words. In the second column the names of the witnesses who supported these charges will be inserted, and the variations between the statement of the Attorney-General and the evidence brought to support it, will be noticed. Any important additions to the original charges which appeared in the evidence

and not in the address, will be also inserted. The third column will contain the defence; and the fourth, the names of the witnesses for the Queen, and occasional references to the Appendix of documents; and in the fifth column will be recorded the general result of such charges and defence.

It is, however, only justice to the memory of the Queen to remark, that this plan of arranging the account of the trial will present the evidence for the prosecution in a more favorable aspect than it does in the trial at length, because a considerable part of that evidence was given in the most fearful and evasive manner, and it was not till after a long examination that many of the witnesses gave any explicit evidence. All this circumlocution, which greatly impaired their credit, is necessarily avoided in a short analysis. A similar observation may be made relative to those points which were evidently contained in the Attorney-General's brief, but which he in vain attempted to substantiate by evidence. In almost innumerable instances he propounded leading questions, which were answered by, "I am not sure," "I do not remember." As his instructions were prepared from the previous depositions of these witnesses, such repeated failures created a strong suspicion that the witnesses had fabricated no inconsiderable part of their narratives, and that, like all liars, they found it difficult to repeat a fictitious statement without variation. Yet this verbosity must be excluded from any abridgement of the trial.

Of still more importance, in the consideration of this part of the life of the Queen, is the character of the witnesses, by whose testimony the charges were attempted to be proved, and as this could not conveniently be introduced into the columnarian arrangement a brief attempt to supply this deficiency must be here made.

Demont and Majocchi were the chief supporters of the allegations. Other witnesses were called to corroborate them, or to prove insulated circumstances, but the names of these two persons are found in almost every page of the Analysis, and on their characters much depends.

On Demont's cross-examination two letters were produced (and admitted by her to be genuine), one of them written by her, *after she was discharged from the Queen's service,* to her sister, and the other to Her Majesty. These expressed her unlimited attachment to the Queen—her admiration of her Majesty's character—her desire to be restored to her situation—intimating that she had refused offers of *high protection* from London—and her wish that the Queen would take into her service *a younger sister, nineteen years of age.* When cross-examined, she attempted to explain these passages as a double entendre, but in this she completely failed. And had she succeeded, her case would have been little better. On another occasion she told Fanchette Martigner that she (Demont) had never observed any thing about the Queen but what was good—that her Majesty had always been surrounded by spies—that her simplest actions, done with the best

intentions, were misrepresented—that she did no action but what she was willing all the world should know—and that the old King was the only support the Queen had. But this is not all: John Whitcombe swore that Demont invited him to her bed-room.*

As to MAJOCCHI, he was discharged from the service of Count Pino for theft.† On his examination his evidence was minute and particular in the extreme, but when cross-examined, fearing his answers might be serviceable to the cause of Her Majesty, he was determined not to recollect any thing. This difference was so great, that it could not have been the effect of chance. In the first instance, he could remember all the rooms and doors in the Villa d'Este, but when cross-examined, he could not recollect that a whole new wing had been added to the building. His knowledge of time varied in the same manner. When examined, he could give not only the hours but the minutes in which certain transactions took place, but when cross-examined, he had no knowledge of time, in truth, "he had no watch." His recollection of numbers was equally convenient, he did not remember whether there were two or twenty-two sailors on board the polacca. So inveterate was his forgetfulness, that he became better known to the public by his favourite answer, "Non mi ricordo," than by that of Majocchi.

To the veracity of these persons, Demont and

* Evidence, p. 311 to 384. 571. 975.

† Appendix, cxciii. cxciv.

Majocchi, and these alone, the Attorney-General was indebted for the confirmation of by far the greater part of his statements; and evidence like theirs would be insufficient to convict a known offender, on his twentieth appearance at the bar of the Old Bailey.

Sacchi's character is sufficiently exposed in the analysis and in the appendix. It is, however, worthy of notice, that, when cross-examined, he said, that on the day of the late King's funeral, he came to London, and delivered letters at "the house where was the Court of the King," (Carlton House), and saw there Mr. Powell. He went there afterwards, and saw "a big man, "rather a handsome man, who did not talk either "French or Italian, and spoke to me by signs."

Gargiulo, the master of a Polacca, acknowledged, that he was to receive 1,000 dollars per month for his time, when retained as a witness, though the Queen paid him only 750 dollars per month, and port charges, for his vessel and twenty-two sailors.*

Paturzo, the mate of the Polacca, admitted, that he received 800 dollars per month, to compensate for loss of time and business. A dollar is worth about 4s. 4d.†; so that, without they were individuals of unblemished reputation, they had great inducements to overstate the facts to the truth of which they were required to attest.

Bianchi tried, by the promise of money, to induce Garignani to depose against the Queen. Garignani replied, that he never saw any thing

* Evidence, p. 127 and 132. † Evidence, p. 102.

improper in the Queen's conduct, and refused to comply with Bianchi's requests, on which the latter called Garignani a fool.*

Birollo declared in the presence of three deponents, that he had never seen any thing indecent on the part of the Princess or Pergami, or not befitting the rank or the respect due to the Princess; and added, that all those who deposed to the contrary were blackguards.†

Rastelli endeavoured to prevail on Pomi to "make a man of himself", by giving evidence against the Queen, adding, that Demont had gained a great sum. He made similar propositions to Giarolini, and told him, that he (Rastelli) had given various persons money, to appear as witnesses against the Queen, besides paying their travelling expences. Rastelli offered Angelo £4,000, and also wages for six years, at 2,000 livres of Italy per annum, if he would give evidence against the Queen. When Rastelli was called, for the purpose of being re-examined, relative to bribing witnesses, he was not forthcoming; and Mr. J. A. Powell acknowledged, that he had sent him to Italy, to assure the friends of the witnesses of their safety. Other couriers had, however, carried dispatches, who had taken letters to the friends of the witnesses. This fact therefore excited great indignation throughout the whole English nation. Rastelli was dischargod from the Queen's service for fraud.‡

* Appendix, ccvi. † ditto, ccxxiv.
‡ Evidence, 811, &c. and Appendix, passim.

Perhaps those who may not attentively peruse the trial, may suppose that the evidence of these witnesses was corroborated by that of more respectable persons. But this was not the case. The only witnesses called for the prosecution, who were known to be credible and respectable, were Captains Briggs and Pechell, and these gentlemen were generally called the Queen's witnesses, because their testimony was of great advantage to her cause. One of them distinctly stated, that he had seen nothing improper in the conduct of her Majesty. When the known profligacy of part of the witnesses is considered, and the total want of corroboration, from the evidence of persons of acknowledged respectability, is it not fair to look with extreme distrust towards those parts of the charges which were not distinctly and individually disproved. It is impossible to bring negative evidence to bear on the whole of such a series of accusations; many of the actions, according to the statements of the witnesses, having taken place in the presence of only one individual.

The Milan Commission is charged, on oath, with practices not less disgraceful than those of the witnesses just referred to. Many documents of this kind will be found in the Appendix. The following statement is from page 857, &c. of the Evidence.

Bonfiglio Omati was confidential clerk to the Advocate Codazzi, at Milan, who was her Majesty's professional agent. Offers were made to Omati provided he would betray his trust; in consequence of which he waited on Vi-

mercati, who promised him an employment in the police of Milan more lucrative than that which he held under Codazzi, provided he would bring certain papers belonging to the Queen, then in the possession of Codazzi. Omati carried various papers to Vimercati at seven or eight times, but not being sufficiently remunerated, he applied to Colonel Browne, who desired him to call on Vimercati on the following day. Omati did so call, and received the remainder of the money which Vimercati had promised. Omati received in all between 350 and 400 francs. Riganti was concerned in this affair. Omati swore he would receive nothing for coming over to give his evidence, his only motive being to remedy the evils he had inflicted.

Having thus delineated the character of the witnesses for the prosecution, it is necessary to advert to those for her Majesty, and the contrast will be as striking as it is satisfactory. Most of them were highly respectable, and several were of noble rank.

Sir Wm. Gell never saw any thing in the conduct, manners, or conversation of the Queen which induced him to entertain an idea that there was a criminal intercourse between her and Pergami. "I never," (said he) "saw the "Princess speak to Pergami but on matters of "business, though I was in the house for three "months at once with them."*

The Hon. Keppel Craven remained more than six months with her Majesty, and did not observe any impropriety of conduct, or any degrading familiarity between the Queen and Pergami. †

* Evidence, p. 555 and 559. † Evidence, p. 531 and 537.

Dr. Holland affirmed that the Queen's conduct to Pergami was that of a Mistress to a servant, and Pergami's conduct to the Queen was unpresuming and respectful. During the whole time that Dr. Holland attended the Queen, he did not observe any indecent, immodest, or improper behaviour in her Majesty.*

Charles Mills, Esq. never saw the smallest impropriety of conduct between the Queen and Pergami, nor any thing in her behaviour, either in public or private, to which just exception could be taken.†

The Earl of Guildford,‡ the Earl of Landaff,§ the Domestic Chaplain of the Pope,‖ the Cardinal Albani,¶ the Marquis Antaldi,** the Priest of the parish in which the Villa d'Este was situated,†† the Marchioness Mosca Pussionej,‡‡ Count Odoardo Machirelli,§§ and Felici, Judge of the Tribunal of Pesaro,‖‖ have given their several testimonies to the good conduct of the Queen. If this list should not be completely satisfactory, the reader may easily add to its length by referring to the Evidence adduced before the Lords, and to the Appendix to this work, pages cxxv to clxiv. To these names may be added those of the witnesses, who appeared rather for the purpose of disproving insulated charges, than of speaking to the general character or conduct of her Majesty.

* Evidence, p. 610 and 616. † Evidence, p. 622, &c.
‡ Evidence, p. 508. § Evidence, p. 529.
‖ Appendix, p. cxxv. ¶ Appendix, p. cxxix.
** Appendix, p. cxxx. †† Appendix, p. cxxxiii.
‡‡ Appendix, p. cxxxviii. §§ Appendix, p. cxl. ‖‖ Appendix, p. cxlii.

The Attorney General's speech contained a standing charge, which was made to apply to almost every place, at which the Queen remained on her journies for even one night. A constant attempt was made to demonstrate, that the bed rooms of her Majesty and Pergami were purposely arranged so as to afford an easy communication. For instance, Majocchi* said, that at Tunis the rooms were only separated by a small room and a passage, in neither of which any person slept; and this evidence was given with all possible particularity, for the purpose of producing an impression unfavourable to her Majesty; but Lieut. Hownam† stated that Pergami's room was not on the same floor as the Queen's, and that there were three or four rooms between that of her Majesty and the flight of stairs which led to Pergami's room. Many other instances might be adduced, where the charges were either refuted or their apparent impropriety explained. But though the arrangements of the rooms, and the inferences to be drawn from those arrangements were misstated by the Attorney-General and the witnesses for the prosecution; it is certain that the Queen generally had some male servant near her bedroom for the object of securing her personal safety. That this was necessary, is apparent, from the circumstance of a man being seized by Pergami in the Villa d'Este, who had been sent by Baron Ompteda to obtain the keys of *her Majesty's apartment, for the purpose of counterfeiting*

* Evidence p. 22, † Evidence, p. 704.

*them.** Pergami was not, however, the only servant who guarded her Majesty. Sometimes Hieronymus, and at others Sicard, performed this duty.†

The *Official* publication of the Minutes of Evidence taken on the second reading of the Bill, &c. in *the House of Lords*, has been consulted in preparing the Analysis of the Trial, and the references in figures are, to the pages of that *official publication*; whilst those in roman numerals, are to the pages of the Appendix to this work.

The preparation of this Analysis has been a much more laborious undertaking than the author anticipated, or probably than the reader would credit. The official publication of the evidence (which does not include the addresses of counsel) extends to one thousand and eight folio pages, every sentence of which it was necessary not only to read, but attentively to weigh. Surrounded by such a mass of unarranged matter, he may possibly have committed some oversights. But he is firmly persuaded that the errors (if any) will neither be numerous or important.

The examination of witnesses commenced on the 21st of August, 1820, and finally closed on the 24th of October.

Having thus closed the observations which it appeared necessary to make preparatory to presenting an Analysis of this important Trial, it is now inserted, and to it the most serious attention is requested.

* Appendix p. cxxxiii. † Evidence p. 546.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charge,
In the year 1814, her Majesty left this country, going in the first instance to Brunswick, and afterwards to Italy. *Attorney General.*	
Here Bartholomew Pergami[a] was taken into her service. He was in the greatest poverty—had been in prison at Lodi[c]—had been employed by an Excise Officer, to mark casks of wine[b]—and, had served General Pino[d] as Valet de Chambre, for three livres of Milan per day. *The witnesses whose names are given.*	[a] Demont's Evidence, p. 247 [b] Oggioni's Evidence, p. 238. [c] Mejanis's Evidence, p. 230. [d] Majocchi's Evidence, p. 3.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
		Admitted.
tholomew Pergami is of ient and most respect- mily.[1] His father was sed of considerable pro- n land and houses.[2] Per- vas educated at the Col- San Martino of Crema, ring the vacation, was under a private tutor.[3] e family was reduced to by the French Revolu- Pergami entered the iment of Italian Hussars olunteer, and held the f Mareschal de Logis, is equivalent to that of it in a regiment of foot. service he always con- himself as a good and soldier.[4]	[1] See Appendix, p. clxxxviii. [2] See an official valuation of them in Appendix, page clxxxix. [3] See Appendix, p. clxxxviii. [4] Sir Wm. Gell's Evidence, p. 548 to 550. [5] See two certificates in Appendix, page clxxxvii, and Teuille's Evidence, p. 628 to 631.	Charges of Demont, Oggioni, Mejani and Majocchi, completely refuted.
rwards he was *confiden-* ourier to General Pino.[1] gami was hired as the 's courier, by Sicard, un- e direction of Sir W. without any communica- ith the Queen. He was mended by the Marquis iari, who stated that he ng known the family, and nterested about them—	[1] Teuille's Evidence p. 628 to 631.	

CHARGE. And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charge.
On the 8th November 1814, the Queen and her attendants arrived at Naples. On the first night after her arrival at that place, William Austin, as usual, slept in her Majesty's room, and Pergami at an opposite side of the house, but on the following morning, orders were given to remove William Austin's bed to another room, his age (the Queen said) rendering his longer stay improper. And by her Majesty's express desire Pergami's bed was removed to a room from which there was a free communication with that of the Queen's, by means of a corridor. *Attorney General's Speech.*	Demont's Evidence supports this paragraph except the dates.
On this evening the Queen went to the Opera, but returned very early and appeared much agitated.[a] *Demont.*	[a] Demont's Evidence.
Pergami took possession of his new room—her Majesty was observed to go from her own room towards that	

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
that Pergami was perfectly honourable, honest, and trustworthy—that he was *above the office he was about to enter*, and the Marquis hoped he would be *gradually advanced*. When the Marquis took leave of Pergami, he kissed him, a customary manner of shewing respect in that country.[2]	[2] Evidence of Sir William Gell, Hon. K. Craven, and Sicard, p. 548 to 601.	
The alteration of the rooms was made by Sicard, without communicating with the Queen, and his principal reason for the change was, that there was a glass door into the garden, which he thought not safe, without some male servant sleeping near it.[1]	[1] Sicard's Evidence p. 593.	The alteration in the disposition of the rooms, is, therefore, fairly accounted for, and the charge refuted.
William Austin was removed from the Queen's room, at the recommendation of the Hon. K. Craven.[2]	[2] Hon. K. Craven's Evidence, p. 537.	
The Queen remained at the Opera till all the performances were over, and returned home *late*.	Craven's Evidence, p. 535, and Sir Wm. Gell's ditto, p. 551.	Charge refuted.
		This charge is not borne out by evidence, (and the evidence is De-

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charge.
assigned to Pergami, and in the morning it was discovered that she had not slept in her own room, (the bed being almost precisely in the same state as on the preceding evening), and Pergami's bed was decisively marked as if two persons had reposed in it.[b] Many persons of rank called on the Queen in the morning, but she was not visible till a late hour.[c] *Attorney General.*	[b] This part of the Attorney General's speech is supported by Demont, but her evidence is not sufficiently specific to bear out the charge, and what she did swear to was extorted piecemeal. On the first examination, she said, the bed was tumbled—on the second examination, that it had the appearance of more than one person having slept in it—but it was not till the third examination, that she spoke of the stains. [c] Unsupported by Evidence.
A few days after this period, the Queen gave a masked ball, at the house of the King of Naples. Her first assumed character was a Neapolitan peasant. She withdrew to a private room to change her dress, and Pergami was sent for to attend her. She took off her first dress, and put on the second in the presence of Pergami *alone*. This second dress was to represent the Genius of History, and was of an indecent and disgusting kind. *Attorney General.*	Demont's Evidence. Demont says, she changed her dress entirely.
She again changed her dress to that of a female Turkish peasant, and Pergami accompanied her, dressed also as a Turkish peasant.	Demont's Evidence. Demont says, the Queen's arms and breasts were bare. Demont's Evidence, p. 245.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
		mont's, on whose testimony no reliance can be placed) the last sentence rests on the authority of the Attorney General *alone*.
The Queen wore a plain under dress which came up to the neck, and was not taken off when she changed characters.	Sir William Gell, p. 548—563.	This charge is attempted to be supported by Demont's Evidence; but 1st, The dress objected to, appears to have been decent. 2nd, The under dress mentioned by Sir Wm. Gell, is a sufficient answer to Demont's imputations, respecting the change of dresses; and 3rd, Part of the Attorney General's statement is unsupported by evidence.
The dress to represent the Genius of History was an imitation of the Townley Curiatius in the British Museum, or Mr. Hope's Minerva. The hon. K. Craven has no recollection of this dress being indecent, on the contrary, he thinks it completely covered the bosom of the Princess.	Sir William Gell, p. 552, &c.	
Sicard and Hieronymus, servants of her Majesty, also attended this ball, dressed as Turks.	Evidence, p. 536. Sicard's Evidence, p. 595.	

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charge.
He did not remain long at the ball, but returned home apparently dissatisfied. Her Majesty followed him home and pressed him much to return to the ball, but he declined. She returned alone to the ball, but did not remain long.	None.
It was observed that at whatever hour she arose in the morning, Pergami rose at the same time, and also that her Majesty was in the habit of breakfasting in her apartments, in company with him alone. *Attorney General.*	None.
During her residence at Naples, Pergami received a kick from a horse, which confined him to his room. Her Majesty hired a servant to attend on Pergami. This man slept in a room close to that occupied by Pergami, and on three or four occasions, observed her Majesty, after her household had retired to rest, go from her own room with much caution, along the passage, to that of Pergami's. On each occasion she remained in the room a considerable time, and this man could distinctly hear them kissing.[1] *Attorney General.*	Majocchi's Evidence, p. 4 to 7. [1] Majocchi said, he heard only whispers.

DEFENCE	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
		This part of the charge does not appear to be borne out by any Evidence.
		This charge does not appear to be supported by Evidence.
		This statement rests on the authority of Majocchi *alone*, who was convicted of perjury; and besides which, Majocchi, when cross-examined, (p. 39) admitted that there was another passage to Pergami's room, by which the Queen might have gone *without passing through the room in which Majocchi slept*. Consequently if this witness is believed, the Queen ran the greatest risk of discovery, without the least necessity.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supporeted the Charge.
Her Majesty resided at Naples from November to March, and during the whole of that period the intimacy continued, and during the same time she lost the greater part of her English suite. Mr. St. Leger left her Majesty at Brunswick, Lady Forbes, Sir William Gell, Honorable Keppel Craven, and Captain Hesse, were left behind at Naples. Lady Lindsay accompanied her Majesty from Naples, but left her at Leghorn, in March 1815. It is probable that at another stage of the proceedings, proper reasons will be assigned for the departure of these persons. *Attorney General.*	Various witnesses, see Evidence, *passim*.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
Mr. St. Leger[1] left her Majesty on account of his health, but hastened to pay his respects to her on her return to England. Sir W. Gell[2] was disabled by the Gout from proceeding with her Majesty, but he occasionally attended her afterwards at various places. The hon. K. Craven[3] originally purposed to attend her Majesty about two months, but remained six months. He saw no impropriety in her conduct.	[1] See Evidence, p. 499. [2] See Evidence, p. 552. [3] See Evidence, p. 532.	It is admitted that the persons named, did leave the Queen's suite, but the unfavourable inference attempted to be drawn from that fact, is shewn to be without foundation.
Lady Lindsay[1] had arranged to quit her Majesty at Leghorn, *before they met*. She had seen no impropriety in her Majesty's conduct. She again joined her at Naples, with her brother Lord North.	[1] See Evidence, p. 513 and 532.	
The Earl and Countess of Llandaff[2] visited the Queen, dined with her, and were at her evening parties, yet saw nothing improper. The generality of English and all the Neapolitan Noblesse visited the Queen.[3]	[2] Earl of Llandaff's Evidence, p. 527. [3] Earl of Llandaff as above, and Dr. Holland, p. 609.	
The gentlemen, and more particularly the ladies, who joined her Majesty at her own request during her travels, might here be enumerated, but the defence to this charge needs no addition.		

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
While at Naples, her Majesty attended a public Masquerade at the Theatre St. Charles, accompanied by Pergami and Demont. Their dresses were of so indecent[1] a description, that the party were received with marked disapprobation, and were obliged almost immediately to retire. *Attorney General.*	Demont's Evidence, p. 256. [1] Demont only called the dress "ugly and monstrous."
Her Majesty quitted Naples, and embarked from Civitta Vecchia, on board the Clorinde, for Genoa, and during the whole of the voyage, Pergami waited at table upon her Majesty as usual. *Attorney General.*	
Up to this period, the Queen entertained a Chaplain, who performed divine service every Sunday, but now the practice was discontinued. The Queen told Demont she intended to have Masses said, for the soul of Pergami's father.	Demont's Evidence, p. 308.
While at Genoa, Pergami attended her Majesty in all her rides and walks, and had a bed room near that of her Majesty, as he had at Naples.	Majocchi's Evidence, p. 9. Demont's Evidence, p. 258.
It was observed here, also, that her Majesty's bed had scarcely ever been occupied at night, while that of	Demont's Evidence, p. 260.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
Her Majesty remained till a *late* hour. Sir W. Gell remembered this, because he was very lame, and "had to stand behind her Royal Highness the whole night."	Sir William Gell's Evidence, p. 551.	1st. This charge was supported by Demont alone; 2nd. She did *not* say that the dress was indecent, but only "ugly and monstrous;" and 3rd. Demont was positively contradicted by Sir W. Gell as to the duration of the Queen's stay at the Masquerade, and as to the disapprobation, stated to have been evinced.
Admitted.		Admitted.
		This charge rests on Demont's authority, but is as immaterial, as it is probably untrue.
		These charges rest solely on the authority of Majocchi and Demont, and are therefore unentitled to belief.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
Pergami, bore evident marks of having been occupied by two persons. *Attorney General.*	
The sister, brother, and mother of Pergami, were taken into her Majesty's household, also a daughter of Pergami's, about three years of age. But his wife was not admitted, and her Majesty who knew that he was a married man, gave out that he was not, and that the child was illegitimate. *Attorney General.*	Majocchi's Evidence, p. 11.
Her Majesty, after having remained at Genoa, until May 15th, went to Milan, leaving Lady Campbell behind. She was afterwards joined at Milan, by that Lady, who remained with her for a short time, but quitted her before the end of the same month.	
When Lady Campbell left her Majesty, she remained without any lady of rank as her attendant.	Demont's Evidence, p. 262.
She received the second sister of Pergami as a companion, under the title of the Countess of Oldi, and while she sat at table with her Majesty, Pergami, his mother, brother, and other sister, lived with the servants.	
It was here put to the vote whether the Queen should be admitted to the Cassino, and decided in the negative. *Attorney General's Speech.*	Demont's Evidence, p. 309.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
		This charge was unsupported by Evidence.
		The latter part of the sentence unsupported by Evidence. The former part admitted.
		Part of this tissue of charges are unsupported by Evidence; the witnesses for the remainder are *Mejocchi* and *Demont*. And the latter is contradicted in one of the most material parts of her statement, viz. that the Queen was not allowed to become a Member of the Cassino.
It appears that the Queen ever made application to be admitted a Member of this society.	See certificate of the Society Appendix ccxvii.	Disproved.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
After a short residence at Milan, the Queen set out for Venice, where she resided at an hotel. Here she was observed to take a gold chain, and place it round Pergami's neck—he put it on her neck, and she again put it on his. This toying continued some time. *Attorney General.*	Bianchi's Evidence, p. 213 to 219.
Mr. Burrell quitted her Majesty's service at Villa Villani. As the English attendants quitted her service, there appeared less reserve in her attention to Pergami. *Attorney General.*	
The Queen and servants after this played in the saloon, in the evenings, at blind man's buff, &c. *Demont.*	Demont's Evidence, p. 264.
In August, 1815, she visited Mount St. Gothard; thence she proceeded to Vannes, where she retired to a bedroom with Pergami, and they remained shut up for a considerable time. After dinner, they went to Madona il Monte, where they slept, and next day they travelled to the Borromeo Islands. Her Majesty had the best apartment assigned for her use, but on this occasion she did not accept it, not affording her an opportunity of having Pergami as near as usual. She took meaner apartments	Demont alone supported any of these Charges, p. 268.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
anna, who was stated to sold this chain, has de- that he sold it.	Vide Appendix, p. ccviii.	Charge refuted.

This statement is made solely by the Attorney General.

This charge rests solely on the Evidence of Demont.

Part of these charges are unsupported by Evidence—part rest on Demont's assertions,—and in the consideration of the last allegation, it is necessary to take into account, that it was on a journey, in the midst of imperfect arrangements, that Pergami dined with her Majesty in his Courier's dress, and that this circumstance appears to have taken place only once.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
for this purpose. On this journey over St. Gothard, Pergami first dined with her Majesty, but he did not do this regularly till some time after at the Villa d'Este. Pergami was in the dress of a courier, and in that dress dined at her Majesty's table. *Attorney General.*	
The Queen now established herself at d'Este, near Como. Here their rooms were only divided by a small cabinet; their apartments were, however, cut off from all communication with those of the other servants; Pergami retiring at night and rising in the morning at the same hour as her Royal Highness. *Attorney General.*	Demont's Evidence, p. 272.
Here he was advanced to the dignity of her Majesty's Chamberlain, and always dined at her table, together with his sister, the dame d' honneur. *Attorney General.*	Admitted.
She remained at d'Este till Nov. 1815, and embarked on board the Leviathan on the 15th of that month. *Attorney General.*	Admitted.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
This part of the Charge admitted by Hownam, p. 702 and 726; but vide explanation made in p. 27.		
This charge was solely supported by Demont, and is therefore not to be believed.		Rests on Demont's Evidence alone.
		Admitted.
		Admitted.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
The best apartments were allotted in the Leviathan, to her Majesty, and the cabins contiguous to each other, were prepared for her and her female attendants, but immediately on her Majesty coming on board, the arrangement was altered, and the room next to that occupied by her Majesty was appropriated to Pergami. *Attorney General.*	Captain Briggs's Evidence p. 160 and 163.
Her Majesty reached Palermo on the 26th of November. Here she went to Court, accompanied by Pergami in a magnificent hussar dress. *Attorney General.*	No Evidence.
Arrived at Messina, the bedrooms were arranged as in other places, except that their rooms were separated by that in which the Countess of Oldi slept. *Attorney General.*	Majocchi's Evidence, p. 17.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
Captain Briggs neutralized his evidence against the Queen, by adding, that it was possible but not probable that Pergami could have passed from his room to that of the Queen's without being observed; that in order to get from his room to the Queen's, he must have passed through the common dining-room — that by the alteration made in the cabins by the Queen, the cabin of Countess Oldi was made to open into her own—that the Queen's room and that of the Countess Oldi divided that part of the ship between them. And that he saw no improper conduct on the part of the Queen, during her stay on board his ship.	Captain Briggs's Evidence, p. 160 and 163.	The unfavourable inferences attempted to be drawn from the arrangements on board the Leviathan are refuted by the witness for the prosecution.
		Unsupported by Evidence.
It was absolutely necessary to pass through the room of the Countess of Oldi, in order to get from Pergami's room to the Queen's, and the Countess always slept there.	Majocchi.	Charge refuted.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charge.
It was observed that her Majesty seldom required that female assistance which ladies of her rank demand; and that she called Pergami "her dear," "her love," and played familiarly with him. *Attorneg General.*	No Evidence for the first p of the charge. "My dear friend," "M heart," Demont, p. 176.
On the 5th of January her Majesty left Messina, and embarked in the frigate Clorinde, the vessel which had previously carried her Majesty from Civitta Vecchia to Genoa.	Admitted.
On the former voyage on board the Clorinde, Pergami was her menial servant—now he was her Chamberlain, consequently Captain Pechell objected to sit at the some table with him.	Capt. Pechell's Eviden p. 158.
Her Majesty took a day or two to consider what she should do, and in the end declined the table and and society of Captain Pechell, for that of Pergami. *Attorney General.*	

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
		Charge unsupported. The statements of Attorney General and Demont do not precisely agree—and Demont was the only witness who supported the charge.
This publicity, so far from raising a presumption of guilt, was the most indisputable proof of innocence.		No unfavourable inference can be drawn from the Queen's conduct.
The Queen complained to Captain Briggs, of Captain Pechell's conduct in the former voyage; and, therefore she did not feel *anxious* to have the company of Captain Pechell: and she also said to Captain Briggs, that it was to prevent Captain Pechell's keeping two tables—and that she thought as Captain Briggs had sat down at table with Pergami, Captain Pechell might do the same.	Captain Briggs's Evidence, p. 162.	Ditto.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
From Messina her Majesty went to Syracuse, where she remained till the 30th of that month, and then proceeded to Catania.	
At first Pergami's bed-room was at a distance from the Queen's, but the same change took place here as on other occasions.	Majocchi's Evidence, p. 19. Demont's Evidence, p. 278.
The filles de Chambres, one night saw Pergami's door open, and her Majesty coming out undressed, and with a pillow under her arm. *Attorney General.*	This was Demont, but she stated the time to have been about ten o'clock in the morning. See Evidence, p. 275.
Pergami's child slept in her Majesty's room, and after in her bed, and was subsequently dignified with the title of Princess. *Attorney General.*	None.
Her Majesty procured Pergami a Knighthood of Malta, and afterwards she always addressed him as Chevalier. *Attorney General.*	Demont's Evidence, 284.
While at Catania she, at first, enjoyed the Society of the first persons there, but after a short residence, she became regardless of all society but that of Pergami's. *Attorney General.*	Unsupported by Evidence.
In the month of March, 1816, she left Catania, for Augusta, also, in	Majocchi's Evidence, p. 21. Demont's Evidence, p. 285.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
The room of the Queen was below, and Pergami's above; and the Queen's room had another entrance that led into the saloon, where they dined.	Majocchi, p. 19.	No unfavourable inference can be drawn from the statement and Evidence taken together.
1st. Demont is the only witness to this fact. 2nd, There is no evidence that Pergami was then in the room alluded to. 3rd, The Countess of Oldi and her child slept at that time in the Queen's room, and 4th, there is a manifest discrepancy between the statement of the Attorney General and Demont.		Charge unsupported by sufficient Evidence.
		Unsupported by Evidence.
Admitted.		No unfavourable inference can be drawn from this fact.
This statement is not only unsupported by evidence, but it is actually untrue.		Charge not proved.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
Sicily. Both the rooms of the Queen and Pergami opened into a court, and no person had access to that court but those two.	
She obtained for Pergami the title of Baron de la Francino.	Majocchi's Evidence, p. 21.
Either at Augusta or at Catania, she sat for her picture. In one instance, she sat in the character of a Magdalen in a dress in which her person was very much exposed. In another picture she was painted in the dress of a Turkish Lady. Along with her was the child Victorine in a similar dress. Pergami was also painted in a Turkish dress. One, if not two, of these pictures were presented to Pergami.	Demont's Evidence, p. 282 to 284.
Attorney General.	Demont stated this picture was in the Queen's possession. She arranged the neck of Pergami's shirt when he sat for his picture. Demont, p. 284, and 286.
Her Majesty set out on a voyage to Tunis, and afterwards visited Greece.	Majocchi's Evidence, p. 21.
For the voyage she hired a vessel, called a Polacre. Her Majesty's cabin, as well as that of the Countess of Oldi, communicated with the dining cabin, and on the other side were some apartments for the other female attendants.	Gaetano Paturzo's Evidence p. 95. Plan of the Vessel, p. 109.
There were two doors leading into the cabin, one for the Queen and the other for her female servants. For a few days, Pergami slept at some distance from the Queen's apartment.	Vincenzo Gargiulo's Evidence, p. 117.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
		These charges were only supported by Demont and Majocchi.
Admitted.		
		These charges were only supportedby Demont and Majocchi.
Admitted.		Admitted.
Admitted.		Admitted.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
But very soon one of the doors, that which served for a communication of the servants into the eating-room, was ordered to be closed up, leaving only one entrance to the dining room, and the Queen's bed room. A bed was ordered to be brought for Pergami into the dining cabin, and this bed was so placed, that when the door of the Queen's sleeping room was open, she and Pergami could see each other while in bed, and hold conversation together. The only access to her Majesty's bed room was through the eating room, in which Pergami slept, and when the door of this room was shut, there was no means of access to the Queen's. The door of the eating cabin was constantly shut after they retired to rest. *Attorney General.*	Demont's Evidence, p. 286. Demont says, she saw them conversing together in this manner, p. 287.
Her Majesty proceeded to Utica. In the House in which she slept there were only two bed rooms; one was allotted to her Majesty and Victorine, and another to the Countess of Oldi, and the other female attendants. The rest of the suite were in various parts of the town. Pergami came at an early hour in the morning, before her Majesty was up, and entered her	Demont's Evidence, p. 286

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
This part of the charge wholly false.	Lieu. Flinn stated that the Queen and Pergami could not see each other, when in bed, if the doors were open, p. 654.	The plan of the vessel disproved some of the statements.
From the plan of the vessel, (Evidence p. 109) it appears that the Countess Oldi slept in the room adjoining the Queen's room, and that there was a door which opened from the Countess of Oldi's room into the Queen's apartment.		These charges therefore are either denied, or explained.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
apartment, without asking leave, and there remained alone with her a considerable time. *Attorney General.*	
Her Majesty visited Savona, or Savenha, or Zavouan, near Tunis. The house in which she slept there, had only two rooms, and the outer room, which was assigned to Pergami had no bed; the inner room, which was occupied by her Majesty, had a very large one. (There was no access to the inner room except through the outer room). The morning after her Majesty had slept here, her bed had the appearance of having been slept in by two persons. *Attorney General.*	At Tunis, the rooms were only separated by a small room and a passage, in neither of which any person slept. Majocchi, p. 22. Demont does not assert what is contained in the beginning of the paragraph, but she *thinks* two persons had slept in the bed. Evidence, p. 289.
From the coast of Africa, her Majesty sailed to Athens. The Captain of an English ship which touched there, landed, and called on the Queen. He was introduced to her sitting in an alcove in a garden, in which were also the Countess of Oldi and Pergami; the latter seated and wearing a foraging cap. Her Majesty rose to receive the Officer, and desired him to be seated. Pergami continued seated, and after a short time, left the place without making the least obeisance. He left the room as if he were a person of equal rank to her Majesty. *Attorney General.*	None.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
n Italy it is usual for men 'ants to go into a bed-room le the ladies are still in bed.	Sir W. Gell, p. 555.	Charges supported by Demont alone.
;ami's room was not on the *story* as the Queen's, and ; were three or four rooms 'een her room and the flight airs which led to Pergami's	Lieut. Hownam's Evidence, p. 704.	Majocchi's statement is distinctly contradicted
		Charges not supported by Evidence.
		Unsupported by Evidence.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
She next proceeded to Ephesus, where she directed a bed to be placed under a vestibule, which fronted a church shaded by trees. Dinner was prepared, but the weather was hot, and her Majesty had retired to the vestibule to repose. Pergami was seen coming from this vestibule in dishabille, when no other person was supposed to be there but her Majesty. Dinner was ordered to be served in the vestibule, for her Majesty and Pergami. She sat on the small bed, and he beside her. None of her attendants were admitted, and she and Pergami remained alone together for a considerable time. *Attorney General.*	Majocchi's Evidence, p. 22 and 23.
Soon after her Majesty proceeded to Aun, a place in Syria. Here a tent was erected, and a bed fitted up within it for her Majesty. While she was in bed in this tent, Pergami was seen sitting in his shirt sleeves, and almost undressed on the side of the bed. From this tent he was afterwards seen coming in a state of undress. *Attorney General.*	In the journey to Aun (Aum) they travelled at night, and slept in the day, under tents. Her Majesty's tent contained a sofa for her own use, and a travelling bed for Pergami: in this manner they slept with the tent closed; Pergami's child was in the tent sometimes, also. Majocchi's Evidence, p. 24. Demont says, that she assisted the Queen in undressing, and that she was undressed as usual. Evidence, p. 290.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
		This charge solely rests on Majocchi's testimony.
; Queen and *all* her at- its dined together under rtico of an old Mosque.	Lieutenant Hownam's Evidence, p. 705.	These statements are supported by Majocchi alone, and the most material part of them is directly contradicted.
; Queen was so much ed on this journey, that ll from the ass, she was ing on, more than once.	Lieutenant Hownam's Evidence, p. 707.	1st. These charges rest on the authorities of Majocchi and Demont, and the latter contradicts herself on her cross-examination, in the most material point. 2nd. Majocchi says that the Queen, Pergami, and his child, slept under the tent, but does not say that no other person slept there,
ıont, when cross-examin- mitted, that the Queen ıt off her travelling dress, :tained the rest of her s.	Evidence, p. 321.	

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
Her Majesty proceeded to Jerusalem, where she obtained for Pergami the order of St. Sepulchre. She also instituted an order of her own, called the "Order of St. Caroline," after conferring this order on several of her domestics, she made Pergami the grand master. *Attorney General.*	Vincenzo Gargiulo's Evidence, p. 125. Demont's Evidence, p. 249.
She embarked at Jaffa for Italy, on board a polacre; finding it inconvenient to remain in the cabin during the night, she directed a tent to be erected on the deck of the vessel in order to sleep in it. In this tent a sofa or bed was placed for her Majesty, and also a sofa for Pergami. In this way they slept, without partition, every night till their arrival in Italy. After dinner her Majesty and Pergami frequently retired into the tent, and the canvass was let down. *Attorney General.*	Demont's, Evidence, p. 292. Majocchi's Evidence, p. 25. Gaetano Paturzo's Evidence, p. 98. Vincenzo Gargiulo's Evidence, p. 119. Francisco Birollo's Evidence, p. 144.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
Pergami, W. Austen, and Count Scavini (Schiavini) were all made Knights of the order of St. Sepulchre.	Gaetano Paturzo's Evidence, p. 97, and Lieutenant Hownam's, p. 740.	In procuring the order of St. Sepulchre, and in the institution of the Order of St. Caroline, no greater favour was shewn to Pergami, than to several of the Queen's other attendants, except that he was made Grand Master of the latter Order.
Hownam believes that Pergami did sleep under the tent —the sofa and bed were three or four feet apart—thinks it necessary that some one should have slept there with the Queen. When there was any sea, that the vessel was in motion, the female attendants were as helpless as her Majesty, consequently a male attendant was necessary; besides, from an attack made on her Majesty's house at Genoa, and from the attempts of Baron Ompteda, the Queen entertained apprehensions for her personal safety, and thought it necessary to have some man always near her. Believes that neither the Queen nor Pergami ever took off their clothes when they reposed under the tent; there was a communication between the tent and the dining-room.	Lieutenant Hownam's Evidence, p. 709 to 770.	The Queen left the cabin, where (had she been so inclined) the commission of adultery would have been more secure and less liable to observation, and the circumstances of the case were such as to convey no suspicion to the mind of Lieutenant Hownam, who as an eye-witness, was best qualified to judge of their impropriety. Besides the Evidence of the Steersmen, since given, completely refutes the charge.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
During this voyage, she had a bath prepared on board the vessel, in which she bathed, no person being present, or in attendance, except Pergami. *Attorney General.*	Demont's Evidence, p. 293. Majocchi's Evidence, p. 26. He says, the bath was in her Royal Highness's cabin.
On the 24th of August being St. Bartholomew's day, great festivities took place on board the vessel, (Pergami's christian name being Bartholomew). At this entertainment the health of her Majesty, and the health of Pergami were drank together.	Gaetano Paturzo's Evidence, p. 100. Vincenzo Gargiulo's Evidence, p. 124.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
The two Steersmen, since the trial, have stated, that when the wind shifted they were obliged to alter the awning, for which purpose they were in the habit of going into the tent at night, without notice, and that whenever they so went in, the Queen and Pergami were reposing separately on their respective sofas.	Private information.	
These circumstances (taken collectively) conveyed no suspicion of an improper connexion to the mind of witness. Hownam never saw the tent closed in the day time.		
The tub was too large to go into the cabin, it stood in another room.	Lieutenant Hownam's Evidence, p. 714. Lieutenant Flynn's Evidence, p. 649.	1st. This charge rests on the authority of Demont and Majocchi. 2nd. Demont thinks the bath was in the dining-room, and Majocchi says it was in the cabin. 3rd. Two respectable witnesses say the tub was too large to stand in the cabin.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported Charge.
The same festivities had taken place on the same day in the preceding year, at the Villa d'Este. *Attorney General.*	Raggazoni's Evidenc 224. Brusa's Evidence, p. 2
Throughout the voyage, the Queen occupied herself in the most menial offices for Pergami. She even mended his clothes. *Attorney General.*	Demont, whose Evidenc intended to support thi short of the Attorney ral's statement. She sa Queen worked for Per daughter. p. 293.
The Queen arrived in Italy in the month of September, and proceeded to the Villa d'Este on the Lake of Como, which she had before occupied. *Attorney General.*	During the voyage P played tricks to amus Queen—he put a cushic der his gown. Demont' dence, p. 296.
During her absence the situation of the rooms had been altered, so as to afford an easier mode of communication between Pergami's and the Queen's rooms. *Attorney General.*	Evidence, p. 295 and Demont and Cassina.
A theatre had been fitted up at the Villa, and the Queen after her return, often performed on the stage, she in one character, and Pergami in another. The characters were of a low kind, and Pergami generally performed the character of a lover. *Attorney General.*	The Queen was si Pergami playing upon s cal instrument, Lucini, The Queen perform part of a sick woman, an gami, in the character of ter, felt her hand, (pulse pose, Ed.) Raggazoni, p. 225.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
t. Bartholomew's day is ge-ally observed in Italy as a ival.		Charge satisfactorily explained.
harge not proved.		Charge unsupported by Evidence.
ergami stuffed himself in manner in derision of the ish Consul, at Jaffa, who very pompous.	Lieutenant Hownam's Evidence, p. 714.	Charge explained.
appears from Cassina's nce, that the alteration consisted in opening an loor way which the witness formerly been employed to up.		The alteration appears to have merely consisted in restoring that arrangement in the rooms of the Villa, which had existed previously to its occupation by the Queen.
ownam does not recollect, the Queen performed the of Columbine, or that she rmed any part with Per-. All the household as-d in the performance, and than 200 persons were nt.	Lieutenant Hownam's Evidence, p. 731 and 732.	That which was performed before 200 persons was surely not very improper, unless the Queen was determined to expose herself to those enemies by whom she was surrounded.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charge.
	Louis Pergami performed Harlequin, the Queen Columbine. Demont, p. 296. The Queen performed the part of an Automaton. Hownam, p. 731.
At this Villa, the Queen and Pergami were seen, alternately riding in a chair with castors, one pushing the chair, and the other riding. *Raggazoni.*	Evidence, p. 222 to 224.
There was a figure of Adam and Eve in the garden, each provided with a fig leaf, fastened on the figures by means of a wire. They put the leaf aside to look at what was underneath, and talked and laughed together. *Raggazoni.*	Evidence, p. 222 to 224.
The door of a room in which Pergami and the Queen were sitting, was accidentally opened, and Pergami was seen having his arm round the Queen's neck, which was uncovered. Pergami got up and said, "what do you want here you son of a dog." *Luini Galdini.*	Evidence, p. 386.
The Queen was in the habit of going out with Pergami in a sort of carriage, large enough for only one	Gerolamo Mejani's Evidence. Giovannis Lucini's Evidence, p. 400.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
These witnesses of Adam and Eve were in a room, and were so placed that they could not be seen from the place where Ingenua was at work.	See Santino Gugiari's Evidence, and the two plans he drew, p. 732 to 733, also Giuseppe Giandinis's Evidence, p. 723.	These two charges are made by one witness only, and as the latter is contradicted, no reliance can be placed on the former.
The witness states that evidence is to have taken place that he or Ill evidence in the city, in a room which had several doors, and many workmen going in the interim.		Charge unsupported.
The existence of mines at and in Ivrea.	Lacroix's Evidence, p. 91.	As to the existence of mines in Ivrea, no evidence might be given, even if true, but which is denied.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supporte Charge.
person to sit down in, and another to sit in his lap. In this manner she went out, with Pergami's arms round her, which position was necessary to enable him to guide the horse. *Attorney General.*	
They were seen together in a canoe upon the lake. *Attorney General.*	Francisco Birollo's Ev p. 149. Raggazoni's Evidence Finetti's Evidence, p. Brusa's Evidence, p. Earl of Guilford's Ev p. 507.
Upon one occasion they were seen bathing together in the river Brenzia. *Attorney General.*	Bianchi's Evidence,
On her return from the East, she brought in her train, a man named Mahomet, who at the Villa d'Este, at various times, exhibited the most atrocious indecencies in the presence of her Majesty, Pergami being present. *Attorney General.*	Majocchi's Evidence, Birollo's Evidence, p Oggioni's Evidence, These witnesses say met exhibited an i dance before the Queer

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
This Canoe could not have held a third person conveniently.	Hownam's Evidence, p. 727.	This charge is very frivolous, especially when it is considered, that the lake is covered with boats, and is the common medium of communication between the several parts adjacent to its banks.
This is not a proper place to bathe in. It is a torrent rather than a river. It is nearly dry at some times and runs with amazing rapidity at others.	Hownam's Evidence, p. 716.	Charge evidently improbable, and only supported by one witness of very bad character.
" It was a most simple dance, by no means indecent." It is something like the Spanish Bolero dance, which has been exhibited at a London theatre.	Vassali's Evidence, p. 940. Sir W. Gell's Evidence, p. 556.	
[1] There is nothing indecent or unfit for women to witness, in the Moorish dance. Witness has seen it at the Government House at Calcutta, the Marquess and Marchioness of Hastings being present.	[1]Granville Sharp, Esq.'s Evidence, p. 781.	The *indecency* of the dance (which is the essence of the charge,) disproved.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charge.
At the Villa d'Este, Pergami's brother was elevated to the situation of Prefect of the palace. His mother was ordered to be called Madam Livia, and the mother and brother had separate tables from the rest of the servants. *Attorney General.*	Demont's Evidence, p. 295.
A tour was next made to Lugano, and some other places, in the course of which, a courier was dispatched with a letter to a person at Milan, and returned with an answer early next morning, while all the Queen's household were at rest. The courier wishing to deliver it without del[illegible] went to Pergami's chamber. He was not there, but in a short time he saw him coming, in his shirt and robe de chambre, out of the Queen's chamber to his own.	Sacchi relates this circumstance, only he does not say that Pergami came from the Queen's room; on the contrary, he did not know where the Queen slept. Evidence, p. 430 and 431.
Pergami told the courier, that he had heard his child cry, and had gone to quiet her, and the next morning he desired the courier to say nothing about it. *Attorney General.*	This part of the story is not mentioned by Sacchi.
Her Majesty visited a place, which has since been purchased at her expence for Pergami. It was called the Villa Bergami, (Pergami) or Barona. In this purchase she expended several thousand pounds. In this place she resided some time, during which	At the Barona, balls were given, at which persons of distinction at first attended, but people of low condition being introduced, and the Queen's servants taking liberties with some of the women, persons of

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
		This, which is any thing but a criminal charge, is probably true in all its parts.
		The charge is unsupported by Evidence.
The Barona is a small Country House, in which no large fete could be given; and the entertainments were, in fact, only to amuse the household and the farmer's daughters. The wives and daughters of	Hownam's Evidence, p. 716.	

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
a carnival was held, and the most disgraceful scenes took place. *Attorney General.*	distinction, were no longer seen at the balls. Sacchi's Evidence, p. 432, &c. The Queen danced sometimes alone, sometimes with Pergami. None but low persons attended. Oggioni's Evidence, p. 238. Persons of a low description attended the balls. The Queen's and Pergami's bed rooms were near to each other. Majocchi's Evidence, p. 28. There was an easy communication between the bed rooms. Demont's Evidence, p. 299.
Her Majesty made a journey through the Tyrol into Germany. On her arrival at Charnitz, it was necessary that Pergami should return to Inspruck, in order to obtain a passport for the continuance of the journey. During his absence her Majesty had one of her filles de chambre to sleep in her room during the night. In the middle of the night, Pergami returned from Inspruck, came into her Majesty's room. She ordered her female attendant (who was asleep) to leave the room, and take her bed along with with her. *Attorney General.*	Demont's Evidence, p. 301.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
respectable persons were present and witness never saw any thing indecent or indecorous.		
Respectable persons and their families attended these balls—the Queen's servants did not come in till the Queen had retired. There was nothing improper or indecent.	Vassali's Evidence, p. 934.	Charge refuted.
Her Majesty was stopped at the barrier, because she had not a passport. Vassali went with Pergami for the passport; when he returned he went into the Queen's room, where he met Pergami, Victorine, and Dumont. Soon after Schiavini and the Countess of Oldi came into the room. Witness did not go to bed, but assisted in preparing for the journey—was never more than a quarter of an hour, or half an hour without going into the Queen's	Hownam's Evidence, p. 718. Vassali's Evidence, p. 938.	Charge refuted.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported Charge.
In the course of this journey, her Majesty proceeded to Munich and Carlsruhe. At Munich the arrangement of the rooms was altered, that Pergami might be near the Queen. *Majocchi.*	Evidence, p. 29.
She gave directions to Sacchi to enquire if there were any English, and if there were, to seek lodgings at some other place. *Sacchi.*	Evidence, p. 435.
At Carlsruhe, a similar arrangement took place about the bed-rooms, to those which have been mentioned before. At this place, her Majesty was one day found in Pergami's room siting upon his bed, he being in bed with his arms round her neck. In the same bed was found a cloak which her Majesty was afterwards seen wearing, and in that bed, certain marks were observed by one of the servants.[1] *Attorney General.*	Barbara Kress's Evid p. 181 to 213. Kress only says, tha Majesty wore a *similar* c [1]This servant was Kres

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
room—saw Pergami in the kitchen, on the stairs, at the door, and in the room of her Majesty. Pergami was not at all undressed.		
It is common in Italy for gentlemen to make morning visits to ladies when in bed.	Earl of Llandaff's Evidence, p. 530.	
		This rests on Majocchi's Evidence alone.
Dr. Holland never observed that her Majesty avoided the English, during the period he was with her. He left her at Venice.	Dr. Holland's Evidence, p. 609.	This rests on Sacchi's authority alone, and his character is sufficiently exposed in the account of the journey to Senegaglia, and in the Appendix to this work.
At Carlsruhe, her Majesty was almost always at Court, or in the family of the Grand Duke. She usually dined at Court or at the Margravine's, the Grand Duke's Mother, and usually supped with parties at the Grand Duke's.	Hownam's Evidence, p. 717. Vassali's Evidence, p. 135.	1st. The evidence falls short of the charge. 2nd. It is improbable that the Queen would have been so much at Court, had her mind been ingrossed by a guilty passion for Pergami.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
In the early part of 1817, the Queen visited Vienna, where she remained only a very short time, and then went to Trieste.	Demont's Evidence, p. 303.
Upon the journey to Trieste, a two-wheeled carriage was purchased by Pergami, in which the Queen and himself travelled together. Before this she had been accustomed to travel in a carriage which contained also Pergami, the Countess of Oldi, and the little Picaroon, her Majesty's Protége. *Attorney General.*	Cuchi's Evidence, p. 167. Demont's Evidence, p. 303.
At Trieste she remained but a few days, yet here again arrangements were made of the bed-rooms, similar to those so often noticed before. In her Majesty's bed there were the appearances of two persons having slept, and Pergami's bed had not been made use of. *Attorney General.*	Majocchi declares in general terms, that on the journey from Carlsruhe to Vienna, Trieste, &c. the arrangement of the rooms was generally directed by Pergami and the Queen, and their sleeping rooms usually communicated with each other. Evidence, p. 31 and 32.
The washing basins in the Queen's apartment appeared to have been used by two persons, and from the situation of the rooms, Pergami was the only person who could have access to the Queen. *Attorney General.*	Cuchi states this, with the variation that Pergami ***and the Countess of Oldi***, were the only persons who had access to the Queen's room. He adds, that he has seen Pergami ***three or four times, about eight o'clock in the morning***, coming out of the Queen's room. He is ***sure*** that she remained ***six days*** at Trieste. Evidence, p. 167 to 181.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
Admitted.		This charge is frivolous, if true.
Her Majesty arrived at Trieste, about noon—went to the Opera in the evening—and about five or six o'clock in the evening of the *following* day left Trieste. The Austrian Gazette was offered by the Attorney General of the Queen, to prove that she left Trieste the day following that of her arrival.	Hownam's Evidence, p. 718. Evidence, p. 165.	The intentional falsehood of this charge is so clearly shewn, that this circumstance *alone* is sufficient to considerably discredit the whole of the case for the prosecution.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
In the course of this journey, when her Majesty had occasion to stop, she and Pergami frequently sat or reposed upon the same bed. *Attorney General.*	At Monte Falcone, the Queen and Pergami went into a bed room, and remained there more than an hour—no other person being present. Sacchi, p. **435.**
Upon her Majesty's return from Milan, where she had been for some time, to the Barona, Pergami, his mother, and his brother, who had formerly exercised some of the most menial offices in the palace, were permitted to dine at her Majesty's table. *Attorney General.*	Demont's Evidence, p. **303**, except, that she does not say any thing of these parties exercising menial offices.
On a journey from Rome to Senegaglia, the Queen and Pergami travelled in a carriage together, and their hands were observed in a situation too indecent to describe. They were also seen kissing. *Sacchi.*	Sacchi's Evidence, p. **438.**

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
		Supported by Sacchi alone.
		The latter part of this sentence appears to be correct, the former unsupported by evidence.
the journey to Sene- he Queen, Countess of ergami, and Victorine, together in a Landau- Countess of Oldi sit- ween the Queen and Sacchi travelled in e (and not as he stated back) and he set out rs *earlier* than the onsequently the *whole* ndecent statement is Carlo Forti (and not was the Courier who nied the Queen on this	Carlo Forti's Evidence, p. 632 to 635, corroborated in most points, by Olivieri's Evidence, p. 911, and Vassali's Evidence, p. 939.	
, after he left the service, assured Luigi hat there was nothing onduct of the Queen	Appendix, p. cc.	

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
Her Majesty returned to Rome, to a palace called Ruffinelli, at which place she was seen going into Pergami's bed room. *Attorney General.*	Here Pergami was ill, and got out of bed to have the bed warmed, the Queen being present. The same witness has seen the Queen put her arms round Pergami, and has seen them kiss. Finetti's Evidence, p. 392. Pergami was ill and in bed, Sacchi went to visit him about eleven o'clock at night, and saw the Queen stretched on a sofa by the side of the bed. Sacchi's Evidence, p. 437.
Her Majesty purchased the Villa Brandi, and an arrangement of the apartments, as before, took place. Pergami was observed, by one of the servants, two or three times, at an unseasonable early hour of the morning,	Sacchi's Evidence, p. 437.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
and Pergami which could give rise to the least suspicion of an improper intimacy.		
Sacchi said, in the presence of Seraphino Sifratori, that he was going to Vimercati relative to the Princess of Wales—that he (Sacchi) had no work, was desperate, and would say what they told him to say. See also two documents in Appendix, p. ccx.	Appendix, p. ccix.	This charge refuted so completely as quite to destroy the credit of the *whole* of Sacchi's evidence.
The weather was so hot that the door of Pergami's chamber was left constantly open, in order to cool the room. It would have been absurd to warm Pergami's bed, and it never was warmed. There was no sofa or bed in the chamber, except that on which Pergami lay.	Appendix, page cxcviii to cc.	Charge refuted.
		Supported by Sacchi alone.

CHARGE, And by whom made.	Witnesses who supported the Charges.
going from his own bed room to that of the Queen's, and there remaining. This was in the month of July, 1817. *Attorney General.*	
At this Villa, as on other occasions Pergami was admitted into her Majesty's presence when she was dressing, and in that state of dishabille, which made such admission improper. *Attorney General.*	Pergami was present when the Queen was dressing, her neck and breast were bare, and she wore pantaloons. Demont's Evidence, p. 307.
In the month of August, 1817, the Queen removed to Pesaro, where she afterwards almost entirely resided. She rode out in an open carriage along with Pergami, and was seen having her hand in an indecent position. They were also seen kissing. *Rastelli.*	Rastelli's Evidence, p. 407 and 408.
Pergami was a man in the greatest poverty. In October 1814, he was received into her Majesty's service, and in the short space of five or six months, he was not only in habits of the greatest familiarity with her, but his whole family surrounded her. When settled at Pesaro, she had Pergami as grand chamberlain; his mother, who did not appear to have held any particular situation in her household; his brother Lewis, who from the station of courier, became equerry; the Countess of Oldi who was maid of honour; Francess Pergami (a cousin) director of the palace; Faustina the sister; Martina, a page; Frances a relation; and the house steward, besides the Piccaroon. *Attorney General.*	Carlo Forti admitted (with trifling variation) the statement of the number of Pergami's relations in the service of the Queen, and their stations. Evidence, p. 639.

DEFENCE.	Witnesses for the Defendant.	General Result.
		Supported by Demont alone.
		This charge is made by Rastelli alone, whose character is sufficiently exposed in the beginning of this chapter, and on whose testimony no reliance can be placed.
Admitting such statement to be correct, it only proves that Pergami, being a deserving man, and an honourable servant, received the patronage of the Princess; and that, as his family needed assistance, such assistance she did not withhold.		Proves nothing criminal or even improper.

Having closed the account of the trial; a narrative of subordinate public events, and of the personal history of her Majesty, from the time when the charges were opened by the Attorney General, to the withdrawment of the Bill, will complete the Memoir up to that time.

At an early period her Majesty made application to Ministers for a Residence, a service of Plate, and an Equipage suitable to her rank. The first of these was long a topic of dispute. The Royal Palaces were denied, but a list of such Houses to be disposed of, in London, as it was thought would suit her Majesty, was furnished to her. The first that she made choice of, was the late Duke of Queenberry's in Piccadilly. She was informed, in reply, that this House could not be obtained, but the reason was not assigned. She next selected Lady Francis's House, in St. James's Square. Neither, however, could this be procured, and as in the other case, no reason was given. The Queen then selected Cambridge House; but that was too expensive. Ministers then offered the Duke of Bedford's House, in Hamilton Place, and Dr. Lushington and Alderman Wood signed an acquiescence, on the part of the Queen, to accept of that Mansion. This was, however, no sooner effected than a letter was received, stating that it was disposed of.

As her Majesty was denied the use of the Plate belonging to the Crown, a public subscription was entered into for the purpose of purchasing a service, and a considerable sum of money was raised.

That money, however, which was intended to be devoted to the purchase of plate to grace her Majesty's side-board, will probably be appropriated in the erection of a monument to record her death. As to the Equipage she required, it was promptly supplied.

Grateful for the respectful attentions of the City of London, her Majesty, in the month of September, offered to the Corporation a portrait of herself, as a demonstration of her respect, and as a testimony of her gratitude for the sincere and zealous devotion they had ever manifested in her cause. In the Court of Common Council, the offer was discussed, but the following resolution was adopted by a large majority. "That her "Majesty's most generous offer of her portrait be "gratefully acknowledged; and that the thanks "of this Court be presented to her Majesty, for "this mark of her condescension and regard for "the Corporation and citizens of the city of "London."

The examination of witnesses having closed, Prince Leopold visited her Majesty on the 27th of October, and at which interview the Queen expressed her surprise at the past conduct of the Prince, towards her, but affectionately condoled with him on his irreparable loss, and made many inquiries respecting her beloved but departed child.

The Duke of Sussex now also visited her Majesty, and arrived at her House at Hammersmith, from Tunbridge Wells, on the 29th of October,

when, after remaining some time with the Queen, he returned to Tunbridge. Many persons of distinction now also hastened to demonstrate their respect for her Majesty, by visiting her, among whom Lord and Lady Fitzwilliam, Earl Thanet, Earl Cowper, Marquis of Downshire, Lord Arthur Hill, Duke of Leinster, Duchess of Somerset, Earl Fortescue, Lord Landaff, Lord Clifden, Hon. Mrs. Damer, Marquis and Marchioness of Tavistock, and Lord Hawke, may be particularized.

On the memorable 10th of November, her Majesty received the news of the third reading of the Bill with great fortitude, and signed the petition, drawn up by her Counsel, with a smiling air; saying, as she wrote the words Carolina Regina, "There, Regina still, in spite of them." In a few minutes, her Counsel rushed into the room with the glad tidings, that the Bill was withdrawn. Her Majesty spoke not a word: she looked fixed and insensible as a statue. Mr. Brougham suggested the propriety of her proceeding immediately to her carriage. Her attendants handed her down stairs, and she still remained perfectly silent, and thus pensive, though evidently agitated, she continued for some time, but at length resumed her usual affability and serenity.—The intelligence of the withdrawment of the Bill rapidly circulated throughout the metropolis, and on the same evening, nearly the whole was illuminated; and all was hilarity and joy. To the surround-

ing villages the news was also speedily communicated, and the inhabitants demonstrated similar feelings of delight.

On the following evening, the illuminations were much more brilliant than on the preceding night, and on the succeeding Monday they were even additionally splendid; and even on the fourth evening a partial illumination took place.

The country kept pace with the metropolis, and the rejoicings extended to the remotest corners of the Island. The bonfires blazed on the hills; oxen and sheep were slain, roasted, and distributed gratuitously among the poor; business was disregarded, and every possible expedient was resorted to, to express the unfeigned and unmingled delight of the nation.

Even the Stock Exchange felt the general impulse, and the funds experienced a sudden rise of one half per cent.

The addresses presented to her Majesty during the progress of the trial, were extremely numerous, as the list subjoined in the note will demonstrate.* Most of such addresses were signed by a

* Worcester, Boston, Bath (ladies), Bath (males), Silk Weavers of Spitalfields, Bethnal Green, Reading, Northampton, Dalkeith, Liverpool, Clerkenwell, Mary-le-bone (ladies), Mary-le-bone (males), Camberwell, Kimpton, Seven Incorporate Trades of St. Andrews, Whitechapel, Aldersgate, Derby, Ladies of Sheffield, Ladies of Halifax, Haddington, Stockport, Halifax, Malmesbury, Captains, Mates and Seamen of the British Merchant Service, Ladies of Edinburgh, Ladies of Exeter, Ipswich, St. Sidwell in the City of Exeter, United Corporations of Mary's Chapel of the City of Edinburgh, Cripplegate-ward, within,

great number of individuals, and many were presented by deputations, in barouches drawn by four horses. The processions of the different trades were unusually splendid, and the sums expended by the addressers exceed all supposition or calculation.

The joy which was thus universally felt and expressed, was not, however, in all individuals precisely of the same description. Some rejoiced

Farringdon-ward, without, Paddington Parish, Spitalfields Parish, Leeds, Leicester, Manchester, Birmingham, Coventry, Tiverton, Kettering, Stroud, Parish of St. Luke (Middlesex), St. Botolph without, Ship-wrights, Metropolitan, Bristol (ladies), Bristol (males), Monmouth, St. Katherine's Tower, St. James's Westminster, Jedburgh, Abergavenny, Newcastle-under-line, Calne, (Wilts,) Chipping Sedbury, Lightermen and Watermen, Edmonton, St. Pancras, St. Saviours, St. George's in the East, St. Pancras Chichester, Ely-place Liberty Holborn, Croydon, Wandsworth, St. Ann's (Limehouse), Farringdon within, Portsoken-ward, Horsley-down, Christchurch (Surrey), Winchester, Oxford, St. Ives, Hereford, Stockton-on-Tees, Cardiff, North Petherton, Taunton, Truro, Sedgeley, Colebrook, Milford, Surrey, Kendal, Ambleside, Kirby-Lonsdale, Milnthorpe, Letter-press Printers, Evesham, Hinckley, Glasgow, United Guildries of Perth, Banff, St. John's (Southwark), Coventry, St. Andrew Holborn (two), St. George the Martyr, Middlesex, All Saints Poplar, Witney, Roman Catholics of the Metropolis, Operative Coach-makers, Sawyers, Hereford, Southampton, Cricklade, Kidderminster, Cirencester, Swansea, United Society of Curriers, Carpenters, Glass-workers, Bakers, Inhabitants of Sudbury, Aberdeen, Dingwall, Wigtown, Crieff, Weavers of Edinburgh, Beverley, Brecknock, Parish of St. George's Hanover Square, Wootten-under-bridge (Gloucestershire), Haverfordwest, Lanark, Huntingdon, West-Ham, St. John's Wapping, Bridge-Ward, Wool-Combers, Braziers, Law Clerks.

for the Queen—others for the nation. Some rejoiced that public morals would no longer be assailed, public decency injured, and political rancour excited. Others rejoiced that the Bill, so unconstitutional and illegal *in itself*, was relinquished, and many regarded it as the triumph of law, of justice, and of *innocence*. But whatever might be the precise cause of such delight, it was most sincere and ardent.

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE PERIOD OF THE WITHDRAWMENT OF THE BILL OF PAINS AND PENALTIES, TO THE INTERMENT OF HER MAJESTY AT BRUNSWICK.

Thus terminated proceedings, which commenced under auspices the most unfavourable, but which concluded with scenes of festivity and joy.

During the trial, the health of her Majesty was good, and her mind tranquil. She always maintained, that whatever might be the fate of the Bill, she should ever be supported by a consciousness of innocence: and her friends felt persuaded that although the measure might receive the sanction of the Upper House of Parliament, it would be rejected in the House of Commons.

But though the parliamentary proceedings had thus terminated, the nation loudly called for redress, and an enquiry into the conduct of Ministers, and into the history and operations of the Milan Commission, were by some regarded as essential to the completeness of the triumph. Those enquiries were not however instituted, and it would be now not only useless, but baneful to

recommence an examination, which has already disgusted the country, and will be a subject of astonishment and regret to the wise and good of future generations.

Though, however, such enquiries were not proceeded in, her Majesty felt that unless she was provided with a palace; her name restored to the Liturgy; and herself crowned; her victory would be incomplete. She therefore determined on immediately requiring to be supplied with a palace, suitable to her dignity as Queen Consort, and directed her Vice-Chamberlain to write to Lord Liverpool the following letter on the subject

"Her Majesty's Vice-Chamberlain informs Lord Liverpool, that he has her Majesty's commands to require from his Majesty's Government, that, without any further delay, a palace and establishment be provided, suitable to her Majesty's rank in the country, in which she is now to reside.

"That this has been much too long deferred, with a view either to the station of her Majesty, or the honour of the Crown: nevertheless, that in the circumstances of the time, her Majesty is willing to overlook such delay.

"But that it must be evident that no further time ought to elapse without finally arranging this matter."

13th November, 1820.

To this communication, Lord Liverpool addressed the following reply.

" Lord Liverpool has received his Majesty's " commands to inform the Queen, through the " same channel, that it is not possible for his " Majesty, under all the circumstances, to assign " any of his Royal Palaces for the Queen's resi- " dence. Lord Liverpool has been further com- " manded to inform the Queen, that until Parlia- " ment shall meet for the despatch of business, " the allowance which has hitherto been enjoyed " by the Queen will be continued to her, and that " it will then be for Parliament to determine the " amount of the future provision to be granted " to her Majesty."

Fife House, 17th November, 1820.

Such reply could not have surprized the Queen and if she had reflected on the subject she could not but have felt that the withdrawment of the Bill of Pains and Penalties was a measure, which not being dictated by a conviction of her innocence of the charges imputed to her, tended additionally to irritate her enemies, and to render them even less disposed to manifest to her any kindness, or to treat her with that courtesy and politeness, to which, as Queen Consort, she was entitled.

To this diplomatic communication of Lord Liverpool, she dictated the following reply, which was transmitted in her name to his Lordship on the following day.

" My Lord,—I have been honoured by her Ma- " jesty's commands, to acknowledge the receipt

"of your Lordship's letter of yesterday, and to "state that her Majesty cannot for a moment "misunderstand its real purport.

"The Queen perceives that the King's ministers "have resolved to prevent Parliament from assem- "bling for the despatch of business, at the time "to which both Houses had adjourned. The "justice and wisdom of the Legislature would at "that period, beyond all doubt, have restored her "to the full enjoyment of those rights, which the "Constitution has vested in the Queen Consort. "The ministers plainly show, that such is their "belief, and they are determined, for some pur- "poses of their own, to delay the redress to which "she is entitled.

"In a measure thus alike contemptuous towards "Parliament and the nation, the Queen perceives "a still deeper design. It is impossible to doubt "that the authors of the late Bill have formed the "project of trying, in some other shape, their "baffled scheme of degrading her Majesty, and "ruining the best interests of the august Family "to which she belongs. Defeated in their first "attempt—disgraced in the eyes of the people— "consigned to the contempt of all Europe—de- "serted by the most rational and respected of "their own adherents, they meditate a new at- "tack on the honour of the Queen. Their specu- "lations must be founded on the hope, that the "public sentiment, so loudly and universally ex- "pressed, will at length be wearied and exhausted, "and that then herself will no longer have pa-

" tience to resist such cruel and endless persecu-
" tion. But her Majesty owes it to the British
" nation to declare, that she has the firmest reli-
" ance upon their support as long as she is the
" victim of oppression; and to herself she deems
" it due to add, that no harassing treatment on
" the part of the King's ministers, will ever shake
" the duty she owes to this generous people.
" She has also the strongest conviction that the
" the King's highest interests are at the present
" moment as much betrayed as those of the State,
" by the evil counsellors who are now once more
" plotting her destruction.

" To the offer of money, with which Lord
" Liverpool has thought proper to accompany his
" notice of the intended prorogation of Parlia-
" ment, her Majesty has no answer to give, but
" a direct refusal. Nearly ten months have elapsed
" since his late Majesty's death, and no parlia-
" mentary provision has been yet proposed for
" her. As long as the Bill was pending, the
" Queen saw the propriety of accepting the ad-
" vances made for her accommodation; but she
" will not accept as a favour from the Ministers,
" what a due regard for the honour of the Crown
" would induce Parliament to grant, as a right;
" and she is still more averse to impose upon
" the people the unnecessary burden of finding a
" palace for her, when the national munificence
" has already provided royal residences, for all
" the Princesses who fill her exalted station.

" The Queen expressly commands me to add,

" that her Majesty, as well as the King and the " country, have reason deeply to regret, that the " persons who have involved all these parties in " their present unhappy difficulties, should still " have influence to prevent that adjustment of " differences which the Queen regards as essen- " tial to their common interests. Her Majesty has " never entertained a doubt, that the King, if left " to the guidance of his own sound judgment and " honourable feelings, would, at once, listen to " the Queen's claims upon his justice, and to the " united prayers of his loyal people.

" I have the honour to be,
" my Lord,
" Your Lordship's obedient humble servant,
" R. KEPPEL CRAVEN.

" *Brandenburgh House, Nov. 18th,* 1820."

In consequence of the communications from Lord Liverpool, and of the manifest intentions of Government, not to assign to her Majesty any palace, or to restore her name to the Liturgy, she determined to appeal to Parliament on the subject, at the approaching meeting, on the 26th of Nov. On that day the House of Commons assembled, but only to be again prorogued. Mr. Denman appeared, on behalf of her Majesty, to present to the House a communication from her; but the Ministers, apprized of the fact, at that moment summoned the House of Commons to appear in the House of Peers, and the message could not be, therefore, received. This ungentlemanly and undignified

proceeding excited universal disapprobation, and induced a yet stronger sensation in favour of her Majesty.

The following is the message with which Mr. Denman was entrusted:—

"CAROLINE R.

"The Queen thinks it proper to inform the "House of Commons, that she has received a com- "munication from the King's Ministers, plainly "intimating an intention to prorogue the Parlia- "ment immediately, and accompanied by an offer "of money for her support, and for providing her "with a residence until a new session may be "holden.

"This offer the Queen has no hesitation in "refusing. While the late extraordinary pro- "ceedings were pending, it might be fit for her to "accept the advances made for her temporary "accommodation; but she naturally expected, "that the failure of that unparalleled attempt to "degrade the Royal Family would be imme- "diately followed by submitting some permanent "measure to the wisdom of Parliament; and she "has felt, that she could no longer, with pro- "priety, receive from the Ministers, what she is "well assured the liberality of the House of Com- "mons would have granted, as alike essential to "the dignity of the Throne, and demanded by the "plainest principles of justice.

"If the Queen is to understand, that new pro- "ceedings are meditated against her, she throws "herself, with unabated confidence, on the Repre-

"sentatives of the people, fully relying on their "justice and wisdom to take effectual steps to pro- "tect her from the further vexation of unnecessary "delay, and to provide that these unexampled per- "secutions may, at length, be brought to a close."

As demonstrative of the feelings of all ranks of the community, with respect to the prorogation of Parliament, without arrangements having been previously made for the establishment and support of her Majesty, the following communication from the Duke of Bedford supplies a striking and important proof. The offer which it contained was, in itself, unimportant; but the sentiments which dictated the communication, deserve especial consideration. The letter was addressed to the Hon. Keppel Craven.

St. James's Square, November 29th, 1820.

"Sir,

"As the King's Ministers have thought fit to "prorogue the Parliament, without assigning "to her Majesty any state, or even providing "means for the support of her title and dignity, "I am led to conclude, that amongst other priva- "tions to which the Queen is thus compelled to "submit, she is without boxes at the theatres.

"Should her Majesty feel disposed at any "time, to honour either Drury Lane or Covent "Garden with her presence, I feel it to be my "duty to say, that my boxes at either of these "theatres, are wholly at her Majesty's commands. "May I beg of you to lay this assurance respect- "fully before the Queen, at any time you may "think fit.

"I am in town for a few hours only, but should "you have any communication to make to me on "the subject, a letter addressed to my house, in "St. James's Square, will be forwarded to me "without delay in the country.

"I have the honour to be,

"Sir,

"Your obedient humble servant,

"BEDFORD."

Notwithstanding, however, repeated applications for a palace, and an establishment suited to the Queen's rank and dignity, she was eventually obliged to continue her residence at Brandenburgh House, which was formerly one of the seats of her Serene Highness the late Margravine of Anspach. To Brandenburgh House, indeed, no objection could be urged, except that it was out of repair, and was unsuited to the dignity of a Queen. It is situated on the banks of the Thames, in the vicinity of Hammersmith. A mansion on this spot was first erected by Sir Nicholas Crispe. In the progress of the civil war it was plundered by the Parliamentarians; and when their army was stationed at Hammersmith and the adjoining villages, in 1647, Fairfax chose it for his residence. It was afterwards sold by the nephew of Sir Nicholas Crispe, in 1683, to Prince Rupert, who bestowed it on his mistress, Margaret Hughes, the actress. In the year 1704, it was purchased by Bubb Doddington, Esq. afterwards Lord Melcombe, who bestowed on it the name of La Trappe.—On the death of Lord Mel-

combe, this villa descended to his relative Thomas Wyndham, Esq. and after passing through the possession of Mrs. Sturt, was purchased, in 1792, by the late Margrave of Brandenburg-Anspach, and Bayreuth. Brandenburgh-House comprises some constituent portions of the building erected by Sir Nicholas Crispe, but the alterations made under the direction of Lord Melcombe, have entirely changed both its external and internal character. The chief approach to the mansion is from the Hammersmith side; and the state apartments comprize five rooms, besides the gallery. The drawing-room was fitted up with conspicuous splendour. The ceiling was painted for Lord Melcombe—there is in it a very elegant chimney-piece, principally representing the marriage of Thame and Isis. The few contiguous state rooms are not large, but were adorned with beautiful paintings. The gallery is 82 feet in length, 20 in width, and 30 in height. The ceiling is of mosaic work, chastely ornamented. In this suite of apartments there was a collection of fine paintings, of the first masters. The marble hall is a spacious apartment on the ground floor, paved with black and white marble.

From the withdrawment of the Bill of Pains and Penalties, to the month of June, in the following year, addresses of congratulation to her Majesty were presented from all parts of the United Kingdom. Some of them were adopted at Parochial, or County meetings, and others were privately subscribed.—Some were presented by

deputation of members of Parliament, and others, by hundreds of individuals of all ranks and descriptions, who formed processions most expensive and surprising. The addresses were, as usual, political as well as personal, and strongly reprobated the conduct of the Administration. To each of them a distinct answer was returned by the Queen. Those replies were principally prepared by the Rev. Mr. Fellowes; and without discussing the political maxims or reproofs which they contained, and as to which various opinions may with propriety be entertained, it must be admitted that they were generally written with elegance and propriety, and that they demonstrated considerable knowledge, both local and general, and were singularly adapted to the nature of the address and the character of the addressers.

Yet some of them were injudicious, and even improper, but those, probably, were *not* prepared by Mr. Fellowes.

A list of the addresses, which were presented at various times, from the withdrawment of the Bill, to the end of the month of June, is subjoined in a note, and the perusal of such list will convince, that first the sympathy, and afterwards the disgust which were excited, by the proceedings against her Majesty, were as universal as they were sincere.*

* Stamford, Cabinet-makers, Edinburgh, New Deer, Dalby, Dumfries, Hereford, Glastonbury, Wokingham, Monmouth, Museum Brothers, Clayton, East Kent Militia, Ashton-under-

Her Majesty now resolved on returning public thanks to the Great Disposer of all events, for the deliverance she had obtained from the evils apprehended, and for the withdrawment of the

Lyme, Gold and Silversmiths, Tidwell, Ramsgate, Leigh, Bray, Truro, Buckland Briers, Irvine, Dover, Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council of London, Ward of Cripplegate without, Ward of Cripplegate within, Ward of Bishopsgate, St. Mary, Lambeth, Great Yarmouth, Huddersfield, Chorley, Gloucester, Boston, Worcester, Hammersmith, Laxley, Edmonton, New Malton, Kinghorn, Schoolmasters, Dunstable, Benefit Societies, Berks, Carlow, (Ireland) Stay and Corset-makers, St. Matthew Bethnal-Green, Farrington within, Hackney, Leather dressers, Northampton, Kimpton and Grately, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Eye, Linlithgow, Huddersfield, Wellingboro', Buckland, Mornhill, Hertford, Kelso Incorporated Trades, Kelso Merchants' Company, St. Neot's, Grimsby, Great Yarmouth, Bury St. Edmonds, Chippenham, Arbroath, Gainsborough, Nottingham, Sutton, Norwich, Brighton, King's-Lynn, Hilton Derbyshire, Castleton, Preston, Andover and Charlton, Whitchurch, East Woodhay. West Woodhay, Whitway and Newtown Benefit Societies, Southwark, Godalming, Aldersgate, St. Leonard's Shoreditch, Clerkenwell, St. James's Westmister, St. Paul's Covent Garden, Seamen, Stourport, Cork, Ardesier, Spalding, Wellington, Axminster, Bow and Bromley, Congleton, Buckfastleigh, Seleby, Whitehaven, Stranraer, Benefit Societies Prestonpans, Dartmouth, Lincoln, Shrewsbury, Caulkers, St. Anne Westminster, Curriers, St. Mary Whitechapel, St. Mary Rotherhithe, St. Anne Limehouse, Letter-press Printers, St. Mary Islington, Bricklayers, Middlesex, Highland Society of London, Farrington without (ward of), Winchester, St. Mary Magdalen's Bermondsey, Rochester, Reading, Bristol, Chatteris Isle of Ely, Hereford, Perth, St. Mary's Chapel Edinburgh, Winchelsea, Dorset, Wraxhall, Worcester, Gospel Church Portsea, Leeds,

Bill of Pains and Penalties. The propriety of the measure, has indeed, been much questioned, and it has been alleged, that it was only designed as an open insult to the Chief Magistrate of the

Bristol, Framlingham Suffolk, Cranbrook, Devizes, Crediton Devon, St. Botolph Aldgate, Corporated Trades of South Leith, Kingmer Sussex, Langport Somerset, New York America, Ely, Worthing, Great Marlow, Dundee Trades, Ayr, Warwick, Marylebone, Guildford, Livery of London, Camberwell, Brass-workers London, Industrious Classes, Westminster, Kensington, Tin-plate-workers, Glass-blowers, Carpenters and Joiners, Trowbridge, Reading, Berkshire, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Poole, Dublin, Guild of Glovers and Skinners, Amicable Society Nottingham, Strand Society, Wellingford, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Concentric Society Liverpool, Camberwell Labourers, Blackburn male and female, Stamford, Newcastle-upon-Tyne females, Blythe, Lymington, Reformers of Yarmouth, Methodist Friendly Societies, Brechin Incorporated Trades and Guildry, Inverary, Brechin Odd Fellows, Dundee Flax-dressers, Shepton Mallett, Cowbridge Glamorganshire, Newbury, Alford, Kent, Kinghorn, Burnt Island, Southampton, Chipping Sedbury, New Shoreham, Langholm, West Teignmouth, Falkirk, Lake and neighbourhood of Horncastle, Colyton, Devon, Oxford, Coachmakers, Bridgewater, Kettering, Northallerton, Smithden, Gallow and Brothercross, Norfolk, Daventry, Stirling, Welwyn Herts, Chester, Poplar, Blandford, Biggleswade, Birmingham, North Leach, Warrington, Warrington Tender, Newlyn, Woodbridge, Sudbury, Margate, St. Pancras Chichester, Abingdon, Lachford Hundred, Taunton, Lichfield, Manchester, Higham Ferrers, Hull, Monmouth, Dartford, Ross, Brecknock, Wrington, Guildry of Dundee, Nairn, Pennycuick, Bedford, Bookbinders, Spitalfields, St. Pancras Middlesex, St. Andrews Holborn, and St. George the Martyr, Lambeth, Committee for escorting her Majesty to St. Paul's, Belfast, Kidderminster, Inverkeithing, Horsham, Romney, Nottingham,

country, and to the Members of the House of Peers who had voted in favour of the Bill. That political as well as religious feeling, determined her Majesty publicly to offer up her acknowledgments to Heaven, cannot be denied, but that she felt grateful for her deliverance from approaching danger and calamity, cannot be disputed; and indeed, she frequently expressed her conviction that the providence of God had interfered in her behalf. Whether such convictions were correct, is not the question, but whether she was sincere, and her sincerity should not be questioned, and if sincere, it was dignified and correct to appear in the Grand Cathedral of the metropolis, there to offer up her acknowledgments and pour forth her supplications. The publicity of her attendance was an avowal of her belief in the great doctrines of Christianity, and was a proceeding neither novel nor improper, but the

Thatcham, Richmond (Yorkshire,) St. James's and St. Paul's Market Lavington, Odd Fellows, Monmouth, Basingstoke and Tadley, St. George Hanover Square, Ross United Friendly Societies, Harrington, North Leach, Sudbury, Hinckley, Leicester, Bath, Cambridge, Appledore, South Molton, the Friendly Societies of the Metropolis, the Friendly Societies of Painters and Glaziers, St. George's Hanover Square, Cambridge, Wotton-under-Edge, Wilton Carpet-weavers, Croydon, Woolcombers of Warwick, Ross, Hampstead, Norris, Marlborough and Ramsbury, Kingsclear, Pamber, Inhurst, Lechlade, Clanfield, Grafton, Bradfield, Stanford, Dingley, Bampton, Southam, Gunmakers, Birmingham, Andover, Whetstone, Hungerford, St. Luke, Kidderminster, Society of Coopers, Coventry.

nature of the procession, and the feelings which the shouts of the populace were calculated to inspire, alas, ill accorded with those feelings of reverence and humility with which a creature should approach the Governor of the Universe.

In pursuance of her determination, on the 29th of November, she attended at St. Paul's Cathedral, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to convey an adequate idea of the intense interest which the procession excited.

Her Majesty left Brandenburgh House in her State carriage, attended by two other carriages, the first of which was occupied by the Honourable Keppel Craven, the second by the Churchwardens and officers of the Parish of Hammersmith. A great number of gentlemen on horseback preceded and followed the carriage. At Hyde Park Corner, the procession was joined by a considerable number of gentlemen on horseback. Sir Robert Wilson and Mr. Hume, M. P. rode at the side of her Majesty's carriage; Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Peter Moore, and several other Members of Parliament, following in their carriages.

Early in the morning the streets of the metropolis were crowded. Various parties of gentlemen and tradesmen on horseback occupied different stations in the line of the procession, and though not splendid, it was interesting from its novelty and the diversity of character which appeared in every stage of its advance.

By the Corporation of the City, she was formally received at Temple Bar, and at half past twelve, arrived at the outer gate of the grand entrance of St. Paul's, where she was received with the simultaneous acclamations of the populace.

Application had been made to the proper authorities that a Sermon might be delivered on the occasion, and the Reverend Archdeacon Bathurst solicited the honour of delivering a Discourse which he had prepared, but the request was refused, and the usual daily Service was alone performed. Her Majesty then returned to her carriage, and the procession retraced its steps. The whole ceremony was conducted with propriety and decorum; but the act unfortunately tended to increase the enmity of those who were opposed to her, although it perpetuated, and indeed, increased the number and the zeal of her friends.

Notwithstanding the abandonment of the Bill of Pains and Penalties, her Majesty's name was not inserted in the Liturgy. It was in vain urged that she was either acquitted, or not acquitted—that in the latter case Ministers ought to bring forward their accusations and commence new proceedings—or that if she was acquitted, she ought to be put in possession of her rights.

This question was one of great difficulty, and of nearly equal importance. Her friends viewed it with a jealous eye, and the nation considered it as a question of prerogative. Her Majesty

felt more keenly this mark of disrespect, than any other which she had been called on to endure, and accordingly urged her friends if possible to obtain the insertion of her name in the Liturgy, or a declaration from Parliament, that by it it was desired that such insertion might be made; but the applications of her friends were unattended with any beneficial result, and the resolution proposed to Parliament on the subject, were necessarily rejected.

The first application on the subject was made by Lord Archibald Hamilton, who moved, on January 26th, the following resolution.

"That the Order in Council, dated 12th Feb-
"ruary, 1820, in which the name of her Majesty,
"Queen Caroline, Consort of this Realm, was
"directed to be omitted in the Liturgy, appears
"to this House to be a measure ill advised and
"inexpedient."

But this motion was negatived by a majority of 101. Two hundred and nine voting for the motion, and three hundred and ten against it.

In favour of this resolution, petitions were presented to both Houses of Parliament from all parts of the nation, and its rejection was learnt with feelings of general dissatisfaction.

Notwithstanding such rejection the measure was still considered as attainable and important, and the Queen constantly entreated her friends, by some method, if possible, to effect the restora-

tion of her name. Petitions continued daily to be presented to both Houses of the Legislature, and Mr. John Smith consented to bring the subject again under the consideration of Parliament.

On the 13th February, he accordingly moved, "That an humble address be presented to his "Majesty, expressing that the House having "taken into their consideration that the Queen's "name has not been inserted in the Liturgy, and "having considered the numerous petitions of "the people upon that subject, are of opinion "that in all the existing circumstances, it is "highly expedient to insert her Majesty's name "in the Liturgy, as a measure that would greatly "tend to remove the discontents on that subject in "the public mind."

But the motion was lost by a majority of 120.

The question which was so repeatedly discussed, was difficult and curious. It certainly involved not the rights of her Majesty alone, but of all Queen Consorts, as well of the present as of succeeding generations. It was, first, whether the Law of the Land had vested in the Privy Council of the King, a power to leave out or to insert as it might think fit, the name of the Queen Consort. It was a question of a *civil* nature, and it was also this, whether that privilege which for three centuries had been supposed to attach not to the natural person of the Queen, but to her exalted public station and character, might after the lapse of so many years, be legally and fairly taken away by the decision

of the Privy Council. By all parties it was admitted that subsequent to the Reformation, the supremacy in all ecclesiastical affairs, was vested in the King, as head of the Church, nor was it denied by the friends of the Queen, that in the reign of Henry VIII. the Crown had the power of regulating the service of the Church as it pleased. The ecclesiastical Government of the country from this time was, however, intermingled and identified with the civil ordinances of the State. In the reign of Edward VI. a Liturgy founded upon these principles was established, and in succeeding reigns, various Acts of Parliament were passed, which from time to time made the Liturgy of the Church, and all matters connected with it, subjects of civil regulation. All this was undoubtedly originally the effect of the Reformation. In subsequent reigns it was altered by Queen Mary, and in that of James I. it was arranged in nearly the same form in which it at present exists. Thus it continued until the reign of Charles I. when it experienced some changes of a partial nature. Church and State were now mingled and connected; the Church and all parts of Church Government, were part and parcel of the State itself; and the King recognized as the head of the Church, was also the head of the State.

The union of these circumstances led to the fact, that, after the Reformation, very different regulations in ecclesiastical matters were adopted, because they were not ordered, as formerly, by

the authority of the Pope, but subjected to civil authority by the power of Parliament. In other words, the Liturgy was established by Act of Parliament, and the regulations and enactments ordained and provided by the Act of Uniformity, and by all others, made in furtherance of the same object, became of equal validity and power, and exacted as much obedience as any other statutes. Thus then, whatever might have been the prerogatives of Henry VIII. it is clear that the regulations of the Church are now part of the civil law of the country, and are to be governed by that law as well as by any other matter. The prerogatives of the King were subsequently lost by the Crown itself, having delegated them to Parliament. In 1661, it was resolved to establish a Liturgy that should unite, as closely as possible, all religious parties in the State, and make them submit to its authority. The object proposed to be accomplished by the Act of Uniformity, was to settle and ensure to all the component parts of the State in *facie ecclesiæ*, a legal definition of all the civil parts of the ecclesiastical Institutions of the country. Such was the principle of this Act, which has been reprobated by a variety of writers, of all sects and parties, and has been by others lauded and extolled. This Act of Uniformity, however, confirmed the Liturgy, as it was left by the various Acts of Edward VI. and James I. It was thus expressly confirmed, and carried into effect, by Act of Parliament. This then was the Liturgy

of Charles II. which, being settled, was annexed to the Act of Parliament, and directed to be taken as part thereof; so that, in fact, it was as legally binding as the Act to which it was annexed. The prayer-book, therefore, really as much formed a part of the Act of Parliament as if it had been inserted therein; and the Act directed twenty-one copies to be made, and deposited in the Tower of London and other places. Hence it appears fair to argue, that it is not competent for the King or his Council to alter the Liturgy, except so far as directed by the statute which has been just referred to. That direction is contained in the following clause, and to the words of which particular attention should be paid:—" xxv. *Pro-* " *vided always, and be it further enacted by the* " *authority aforesaid, that, in all those prayers,* " *litanies, and collects, which do, in any way, relate* " *to the King, Queen, or Royal Progeny, the names* " *be* ALTERED AND CHANGED, FROM TIME TO " TIME, AND FITTED TO THE PRESENT OC- " CASION, *according to the direction of lawful* " *authority.*" By those who support the prerogatives of the King and his Council in this matter, and contend that they are absolute, it has been urged, that this clause is conclusive on the subject, and that such prerogatives cannot be, with any propriety, disputed.

But it has been replied, that the words of the clause only sanction the alteration of names as suited the occasion, and that if more had been intended by those who prepared the Act, it is

absurd to suppose that the statute would not also have given power to *omit*, and not merely to *alter* and *change*, so as simply to adapt the words to the names of the then present Royal Family. Such observation unquestionably deserves the most serious consideration.

This Act was made after a period of civil disturbance, and it adopted the principle adhered to in former liturgies, of omitting the name of the Queen, as was the case in the reigns of Henry VIII., James I., and Charles I. When the Act of Uniformity passed, Charles II. was not married; and a blank was left in one Collect for the name of the Queen, leaving it perfectly to be understood, that it was to stand, pro re nata, for the insertion of the Queen Consort's name when the King should marry; and not only was the blank left for the name, but also for the titles; and in fact, after the marriage of the King, some copies of the Book of Common Prayer had the blank filled up, and the name of her Majesty, the Queen Consort, inserted. From that time down to the reign of George I. the Queen Consorts had been habitually prayed for. But then, it has been urged, that the Consort of George I. was not so prayed for, and the chain was therefore broken. To that objection it has been replied, that it is insufficient to sustain the alteration made by his present Majesty. George I. ascended the Throne in 1714, and for eighteen years before that period, the Princess of Zell had been confined in a Hanoverian prison. She was never known, nor

was she represented in this country; and she remained in that prison until her death. For the period of eighteen years prior to his accession to the Throne of England, George I. had also been divorced from her; and she was, therefore, neither legally his Consort, nor was she so considered by the nation, who never referred to her. Again; though George I. had not been divorced from the Princess of Zell, by Act of Parliament, he would of course have obtained such Act if he had applied, since the real divorce was notorious, and by both parties it was acknowledged. The Duchess of Kendal was in fact his wife; and, therefore, it would have been absurd to have included the name of the Princess of Zell in the Liturgy, and its omission cannot, with fairness, be adduced as a precedent. With such exceptions, these Queen Consorts have been habitually prayed for, and the consuetudo regni being so established and demonstrated, furnishes a powerful argument in favour of the right of the Queen so to be prayed for, established by usage; and especially, as by the Act of Uniformity, the Common Prayer Book became part of the statute law of the land; and was thereby no longer entrusted to the management of the King or his Council. In addition to such arguments, it has been contended that the Queen, though a subject, has privileges and rights which attach to her in her political character—that it is not in the power of the King to give, or to take them away—that the privilege of having her name included in the Liturgy is among the number, and

that, therefore, on every principle of reasoning—from analogy—precedent—and law it is demonstrative, that the exclusion of the name of her Majesty originally was improper, and that by its subsequent non-introduction a precedent was established which is principally to be deplored, because it affects the constitutional rights and liberties of the people.

In the speech delivered by his Majesty, at the opening of the Session of Parliament, he recommended that some provision should be made for the Queen, and it was accordingly proposed by the Administration, that the annual sum of £50,000 should be allowed her.

Disappointed at the refusal of Parliament to interfere in the question of the Liturgy, her Majesty was advised to decline the acceptance of the profferred grant, unless her name was restored. Her Majesty was, however, averse to the measure; she felt that as it was the first act of Royal favour which, on her, had been bestowed, she should accept it: and, that whilst she would not relinquish the question of the Liturgy altogether, it should not at present be further urged. In reply to such suggestions it was stated, that if she refused to accept the grant, the ministry would yield to her wishes, with respect to the Liturgy; since she would never be allowed even by them, to remain without funds, and without a palace, or an establishment; and that she would thus at once obtain those rights and privileges which she would otherwise, ineffectually endeavour to procure. These arguments were,

however, ineffectual to convince her Majesty; and until she was assured that efforts should be made by THE WHIGS to raise her an annuity by the contributions of themselves, and of the people, adequate to the proposed Parliamentary grant; she would not assent to any message being transmitted from her on the subject. At length, she was induced to sign the following message, which was communicated to the House of Commons, by Mr. Brougham, on the 31st of January.

"CAROLINE R.

"The Queen having learned, that the House "of Commons has appointed this day for taking "into consideration the part of the King's most "gracious Speech which relates to her, deems it "necessary to declare, that she is duly sensible "of his Majesty's condescension in recommend- "ing an arrangement respecting her to the "attention of Parliament. She is aware that "this recommendation must be understood as re- "ferring to a provision for the support of her "estate and dignity; and from what has lately "passed, she is apprehensive that such a provi- "sion may be unaccompanied by the possession "of her rights and privileges, in the ample mea- "sure wherein former Queens Consort, her Royal "predecessors, have been wont in times past to "enjoy them.

"It is far from the Queen's inclination, need- "lessly to throw obstacles in the way of a settle- "ment, which she desires in common with the

" whole country, and which she feels per-
" suaded the best interests of all parties equally
" require; and being most anxious to avoid
" every thing that might create irritation, she
" cautiously abstains from any observation upon
" the unexampled predicament in which she is
" placed; but she feels it due to the House and
" to herself, respectfully to declare, that she per-
" severes in the resolution of declining any ar-
" rangement while her name continues to be ex-
" cluded from the Liturgy."

" *Brandenburgh House, January* 31*st*, 1821."

Notwithstanding this protest, the House proceeded to make the proposed grant, and although it did not totally disregard the communication so made, yet it only excited feelings of surprise and regret, and was viewed by her enemies as an act of defiance, and by her friends as imprudent and even absurd. Those opinions in the end were demonstrated to be correct, for although at a meeting of some of the leading whigs, the Earl Fitzwilliam, and a few others, generously offered to become contributors to a large amount, the measure did not receive general support, and it was totally abandoned. The failure of the measure occasioned to the Queen much real grief and regret. She felt that by the reception of the grant at this time, after its previous rejection, she would be lessening her dignity, and laying her character open to the charges of caprice and cowardice, and yet she knew that without re-

sources she could not maintain her establishment, and must either borrow without the probability of at present reimbursing, or make an appeal to the public, which might not, under all the circumstances, be attended with success.

When the Bill had received the sanction of the legislature, she received from Lord Liverpool the following letter.

"Lord Liverpool thinks it right to inform the "Queen, that the Bill for her Majesty's annuity, "having received the Royal assent, the King's "warrant has been signed and countersigned; "and the letters patent will probably be com- "pleted in the course of next week.

"Lord Liverpool conceives that it may be con- "venient to the Queen, as soon as possible to be "apprized, that from the whole sum of £62,500, "being five quarters from the 5th January, 1820, "to the 5th April, 1821, are to be deducted, "the various sums issued to the Queen, since the "decease of his late Majesty, amounting altoge- "ther to £30,277 8s. 10d. so that there will be "due to the Queen on the 5th April next, the "sum of £32,222 11s. 2d. and arrangements will "be made for the issue of this sum, in as few days "after the 5th April, as the forms of office will "permit."

"*Fife-House, 2d March,* 1821."

It now became necessary for her Majesty to determine what line of conduct she would adopt.

She had not at this time ten pounds in the house, and her bankers were in possession of no assets. THREE THOUSAND POUNDS had been already advanced to her by her Bankers, on the security of two distinguished Noblemen, and yet further sums were required. In order therefore to avoid all further discussion she immediately transmitted the following reply.

"The receipt of Lord Liverpool's letter of the "2nd instant, has informed the Queen that her "Annuity Bill had received the Royal assent. "The Queen considers the present measure as "emanating from his Majesty: and cannot doubt "but that it is connected in his generous mind "with the gracious intention of inserting her "Majesty's name in the Liturgy: and of in- "vesting her with all those rights and dignities, "which have uniformly been conferred upon the "Consorts of former Kings. This pleasurable "expectation has removed the repugnance which "would otherwise have predominated in her "Majesty's mind, to accept the grant announced "by Lord Liverpool.

"The refusal of Prince Leopold to give up "Marlborough House, has obliged her Majesty "to purchase Cambridge House. This purchase "will cost the Queen £15,000, and this sum with "the gross amount of deductions, mentioned by "Lord Liverpool, some of which were totally "unexpected, and combined with her Majesty's "current expences, will leave her totally without

" money on the 5th of April next. When her " Majesty is on the point of commencing an es- " tablishment suited to her rank, some prepara- " tory expense must unavoidably be incurred; " for which her Majesty is convinced that it " would not have been less in unison with his " Majesty's wishes than with those of his people, " if some specific provision had been made."

Brandenburgh House, 4th March, 1821.

This reply excited general surprize. It so completely varied with her former communication to Parliament on the subject, and without any real or imaginary cause for such variation, that her sanguine friends were disappointed at this instance of vascillation, and those who were opposed to her of course accused her of meanness and of cowardice. The occurrence she ever after deplored, and frequently said, "Nothing distresses " me more than that, because I must appear to " every one as having forfeited my word, and " concerning money, which I never regard."

The residence of her Majesty at Brandenburgh House, although healthy and pleasant, was not suited to the Queen Consort of Great Britain. She accordingly determined on obtaining some suitable premises in London. To her, Marlborough House, which was near to Carlton Palace, and which was then tenanted by the Prince Leopold, appeared to be peculiarly desirable, and she accordingly contracted for the purchase of the lease; but it having been communicated to her,

that by its selection the King was much displeased, and had determined in case she there resided, never again to return to Carlton Palace, she directed the following letter to be addressed to the Earl of Liverpool.

"*Brandenburgh House*, 11*th January*, 1820.

"My Lord,

"I have received the Queen's commands to inform your Lordship, that her Majesty has been in treaty for the purchase of the lease of Marlborough House, and that she has now the immediate prospect of concluding the bargain; but it has been suggested to her Majesty, upon authority entitled to great attention, that the King had intimated a strong disinclination to her Majesty fixing her residence there, and had even expressed an intention of not returning to Carlton Palace in that event.

"Before the transaction is closed, the Queen is anxious to be informed whether or not there is any foundation for this statement, and her Majesty has directed me to request this information from your Lordship."

"I have the honour to be,

"My Lord,

"Your very obedient servant,

"K. Craven."

After an interval of a few days, the Earl of Liverpool addressed to the Hon. Keppel Craven the following reply:—

" *Fife House, 17th January*, 1821.

" SIR,

" I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your explanatory letter, respecting the lease of Marlborough House.

" The terms in which your letter of the 11th inst. were couched, rendered it impossible for me to do more than to lay the substance of it before his Majesty, and I have since laid before him your explanation.

" The King has commanded me to say, in answer, that, as Prince Leopold is in the actual possession of Marlborough House, with a term of five years unexpired, and as his Royal Highness has never informed his Majesty of his desire to dispose of that term to the Queen, the King must decline giving any opinion upon the subject.

" I have the honour to be,

" Sir,

" Your very obedient humble servant,

" LIVERPOOL."

Thus disappointed of the residence she preferred, she now resolved on purchasing the lease of CAMBRIDGE HOUSE, in South Audley-street, and in that occasionally dwelt till the period of her death, though the greater part of her time she continued to spend at Hammersmith.

The Queen now appeared more in public. She visited the theatres, where she was received with the most decided demonstration of respect; Public Institutions, where the Governors and

Committees welcomed her visits with enthusiasm; and, for the benefit of one of which, she attended at a concert, on the first of March, at the Mansion-house of the city of London. That concert was held for the benevolent purpose of extricating from debt a Lancasterian Institution, founded in 1813 by Mr. Alderman Wood, in the City-road, in the north-eastern part of the metropolis, in which several hundred children are yearly educated. To that Institution she also presented TWO HUNDRED POUNDS, and promised that during her life such sum should be ANNUALLY contributed by her. By such examples of benevolence, and especially by attachment which they indicated that she felt to the instruction of the poor, and to that education on liberal principles, she gratified her friends, and increased their number and respectability.

By the nobility she was now recognized, and from the following distinguished personages she received visits more or less frequent. The list is long and uninteresting; but it is eminently important that it be introduced, because it demonstrates, that by the higher ranks of society her character was respected, and that they deemed it their duty as their honour to present themselves to her Majesty. Some *few* of the individuals whose names are inserted only visited her Majesty once during her residence in England, but the majority were introduced to her several times, and many of them were not unfrequently guests at her table.

Duke of Sussex, Prince Leopold, Duke and Duchess of Leinster, Duke and Duchess of Bedford, Duchess of Somerset, Duke of Norfolk, Earl and Countess of Jersey, Marquis and Marchioness of Tavistock, Earl and Lady Fitzwilliam, Lord and Lady Wm. Russell, Lord and Lady Milton, Lord and Lady Ossulston, Earl and Countess of Tankerville, Lady Francis, Hon. Mrs. H. Bennet, Lady R. Spencer, Lady Mary Bentinck, Lady Charlotte Lindsay, Lady Kingston, Dowager Lady Monson, Misses Monson, Dowager Lady de Clifford, Lady Vernon, Lady Perceval, Countess of Harrington, Dowager Countess Albemarle, Dowager Lady Tancred, Hon. Mrs. Damer, Lady Sarah Butler, Lady Lucy Foley, Lady Louisa Lambton, Lady Elizabeth Whitbread, Earl of Essex, Lord Nugent, Viscount Folkestone, Earl of Darlington, Lord Robert Spencer, Earl Grosvenor, Lord A. Hamilton, Earl of Oxford, Lord Wm. Fitzgerald, Lord Ballantyne, Lord Viscount Duncannon, Earl of Albemarle, Earl of Guildford, Viscount Anson, Marquis of Devonshire, Lord Arthur Hill, Earl of Fortescue, Lord Foley, Lord Harley, Lord Henry Fitzgerald, Lord John Russel, Lord James Stewart, Lord Landaff, Lord Clifden, Earl Carnarvon, Lord Francis Osborne, Earl Grey, Hon. Henry Grey Bennet, M.P. Sir Robert Wilson, M. P. Sir William Guise, Bart. M. P. Sir H. Englefield, Bart. Sir Godfred Webster, Sir Robert Dundas, Sir Bethell Codrington, Bart. Sir Simon Clarke, Sir William De Crespigny, Bart. M. P. Honourable William Burrell,

Hon. R. Smith, M. P. Hon. Douglas Kinnaird, Lieut.-General Sir Ronald Ferguson, M. P. Hon. Charles Butler, Hon. G. Agar Ellis, Sir Thomas M. Wilson, Sir Francis Burdett, Bart. M. P. Sir M. W. Ridley, Bart. M. P. Sir G. Robinson, Viscount Bury, M. P. Hon. M. Wood, and family, Sir G. Noel, Bart. M. P. Sir Wm. Rowley, M. P. Sir G. Anson, M. P. Hon. T. Dundas, M. P. Hon. C. M. Pelham, M. P. Hon. G. Blaguière, and Lady Blaguière, Peter Moore, Esq. M. P. W. Whitbread, Esq. M. P. Sandford Graham, Esq. M. P. Joseph Birch, Esq. M. P. Thomas Creevey, Esq. M. P. T. Martin, Esq. M. P. Robert Gordon, Esq. M. P. W. P. Honeywood, Esq. M. P. M. A. Taylor, Esq. M. P. and Mrs. Taylor, Robert Hurst, Esq. M. P. ——— Ellice, Esq. M. P. C. F. Palmer, Esq. M. P. A. Baring, Esq. M. P. E. B. Wilbraham, Esq. M. P. Joseph Hume, Esq. M. P. and Mrs. Hume, R. Bernal, Esq. M. P. General Phipps, M. P. T. Hobhouse, Esq. M. P. C. Western, Esq. M. P. Pascoe Grenfell, Esq. M. P. Richard Vyall, Esq. M. P. William Williams, Esq. M. P. Colonel Hughes, M. P. S. Whitbread, Esq. M. P. Lieut.-Colonel Roberts, M. P. Thomas Pares, Esq. M. P. T. B. Monck, Esq. M. P. Francis Pym, Esq. M. P. A. Baring, Esq. M. P. J. C. Lambton, Esq. M. P. W. A. Maddocks, Esq. M. P. T. A. Warre, Esq. M.P. R. P. Pryse, Esq. M.P. Colonel Palmer, M.P. T. B. Lennard, Esq. M.P. G. P. Scudamore, Esq. M.P. J. Macdonald, Esq. M. P. Henry Bright, Esq. M. P.

R. Smith, Esq. M. P. G. Heathcote, Esq. M. P. R. Boughton, Esq. M. P. Mr. and Mrs. Challenor, Mr. and Mrs. Ponsonby, General Lister, Miss Lister, and Miss M. Lister, Mr. and Mrs. F. Webb, Rev. Archdeacon Bathurst, Mrs. H. Bathurst, Rev. G. M. Bates, Lieut.-Colonel Jones, Major Russell, Lieut.-General Long, Major Dodd, Admiral Halliday, Rev. G. Lock, Captain Gardiner, Dr. Holland, General Wetherell, Rev. Edward Grey, James Fitzgerald, Esq. Lieut.-Colonel Fitzgerald Stanhope, Colonel Webb.

The King had long determined that his CORONATION should occur in the month of July of this year, and the preparations were now rapidly proceeding. At such ceremonies it had been almost invariably the custom that Queens Consort should be crowned, and the propriety of maintaining the custom cannot be disputed. Her Majesty felt that if she was only nominally Queen Consort, then all those rights which according to consuetudo regni had been enjoyed by them were at once declared to be nullities. Already it had been determined that her name should not be included in the Liturgy. In either of the Royal Palaces she was not allowed to reside—plate was refused her; and now her husband, the King of Great Britain was to be crowned in the presence of the nation, and herself was destined not to participate in the ceremony. That it is merely a ceremony must indeed be admitted, and if the coronation of

Kings was discontinued, no possible evil could result. But whilst such ceremony was continued in one case, the Queen felt that without some adequate reason, she ought not to be prevented from also enjoying the honour so conferred. To the King she, therefore, personally addressed a letter, and accompanied it by a request, that it might be unopened by the ministers, but might be at once forwarded to his Majesty. In that letter she requested that she should be crowned; and briefly stated the reasons why she expected that her requisition would not be refused. The King had, however, long directed that no letter from the Queen should be communicated to him, until its contents were first perused by his ministers; and such letter was accordingly opened by them. With the nature of the application he was, however, apprized, and after having deliberated with his law officers, on the legality of the claim made by her Majesty, to be crowned *as of right;* he directed the following reply to be transmitted.

" Lord Liverpool has the honour to inform the " Queen, that as it has been his Majesty's invariable " determination, for some years, to receive no " written communication from the Queen, except " through his government; the King directed " Lord Liverpool to open the Queen's letter, and " Lord Liverpool having laid the substance of it " before his Majesty, the King has commanded " Lord Liverpool to say, in answer, that it is his

" Majesty's prerogative to regulate the ceremonial " of his coronation in such manner as he may " think fit; that the Queen can form no part of " that ceremonial, except in consequence of a " distinct authority from the King; and that it is " not his Majesty's intention, under the present " circumstances, to give any such authority.

" Lord Liverpool thinks it must be unnecessary " in consequence of this communication, to no- " tice the other points in the Queen's letter; but " he will further add that the King has dispensed " with the attendance of all Ladies upon his " Coronation.

" *Fife House, 4th May*, 1821."

Unintimidated by this reply, her Majesty resolved on memorializing the King and on representing to him, that even if he refused to her those rights which she claimed as attatching to her political character, yet that as many manors and lands were held on the express tenure, that services should be done by them for Queens Consorts at their coronations, it was peculiarly proper that such tenures should not be invalidated, nor such services discontinued; lest their discontinuance should be subsequently construed into a precedent. To the King she, therefore, addressed the following memorial, and anxiously awaited his determination thereon.

"TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY."

"The Memorial of her Majesty the Queen."

"Sheweth,

"That your Majesty has by your Royal Pro-
"clamation, bearing date at Carlton House, the
"ninth day of June instant, declared your Royal
"will and pleasure to celebrate the solemnity of
"your Royal Coronation, upon Thursday the
"19th of July next, at your palace, at Westmin-
"ster, but that directions have not been given
"for the Coronation of the Queen, as hath here-
"tofore been accustomed on the like occasions.

"That divers of your Majesty's subjects by
"antient customs and usages of these realms, as
"also in regard of divers tenures of sundry
"manors, lands, and other hereditaments do
"claim, and are bound to do and perform divers
"services, on the day and at the time of the
"Coronation of the Queens Consort of these
"realms, as in times precedent their ancestors,
"and those from whom they claim, have done
"and performed at the Coronation of Queen's
"Consort in times past.

"That the Queen most dutifully claims as of
"right, to celebrate the ceremony of the Royal
"Coronation, and to preserve as well as her
"Majesty's said right, as the aforesaid lawful
"rights and inheritances of others of your
"Majesty's subjects.

"The Queen respectfully prays that your "Majesty will be graciously pleased forthwith "to issue your Royal Proclamation thereby to "appoint the same 19th day of July next, at "Westminster, aforesaid, to celebrate the cere- "mony of the Coronation as Queen Consort, and "to direct that all such as by the said customs "and usages, and tenures, are bound to do and "perform at the services aforesaid, do duly give "their attendances accordingly, at the said day "and time of the Coronation aforesaid, in all "respects furnished as to so great a solemnity "appertaineth, and answereth to the dignities "and places which every one of them holdeth "and enjoyeth; and further, that your Majesty "will be graciously pleased to issue your Royal "Commission, under your great seal, appointing "Commissioners to receive, hear, and determine "the petitions and claims which shall be made "to them in this behalf.

"And the Queen, as in duty bound, will ever "pray, &c."

This memorial was of course transmitted to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and by him it was submitted to the King. The public now felt an intense anxiety on the subject. The Coronation itself was a ceremony which, at a time when the nation groaned under the pressure of poverty, when a national debt, unequalled in magnitude in the history

of the world; when poor rates were quadrupled within half a century; and taxes as enormous as they were ruinous; was regarded not only as unwise, but improper; and when, in addition to these circumstances, it was made a political instrument of oppression, its impropriety became additionally evident, and it was either desired that the measure should be wholly abolished, or that all parties should meet at the Throne and Altar, and consign to oblivion their various contentions. But the Ministers determined otherwise to act. They resolved that the King should be crowned, but that the Queen should not be, and Lord Sidmouth accordingly addressed to Lord Hood, as her Majesty's Chamberlain, the following letter.

"My Lord,

"Having taken the earliest opportunity of laying before the King, the memorial of the Queen claiming as of right to celebrate the ceremony of her Coronation, and praying that his Majesty would be graciously pleased to issue the Proclamation, fixing the 19th instant for that purpose, and directing that all such, as by custom, usage, and tenures, are bound to perform services on that occasion, should attend for that purpose; his Majesty was pleased to refer the said memorial to the Attorney and Solicitor General, and those Officers having reported to his Majesty their opinion, that the Queen Consort has not any claim, of right, to celebrate the ceremony of the Coronation; and that the rights

of those who may hold lands or offices by the tenures of performing services at the Coronation of the Queen Consort, (if any such there be), will not be prejudiced or affected by that ceremony not being celebrated; I have to acquaint your Lordship, that his Majesty has not been pleased to issue any directions in pursuance of the prayer of the Queen's memorial.

"I take this occasion of acknowledging the receipt of your Lordship's letter of yesterday's date, in which your Lordship signifies the wish of the Queen to be heard forthwith by her Counsel, in support of the prayer of the above mentioned memorial, which your Lordship describes as a memorial to the King in Council, and I have to inform your Lordship, that as the said memorial was addressed to the King himself, and not to his Majesty in Council, (as your Lordship supposes), no opportunity can occur for the Queen's Counsel being heard in support thereof."

"I have the honour to be,
"Your Lordship's,
"Obedient humble Servant,
"SIDMOUTH."

To Lord Hood.

The perusal of the foregoing letter will have explained that the memorial was improperly addressed, solely to the King, and not to his Majesty in Council, and also that it was the desire of the Queen, if possible, by the arguments

of her Law Officers, to convince those who were opposed to her, that her claim of right was legal and just, and ought to be allowed.

The following memorial was therefore immediately prepared and transmitted.

"To the King's most Excellent Majesty in Council."

"The Memorial of her Majesty the Queen,

"Sheweth,

"That your Majesty having been pleased to "issue your Royal Proclamation appointing the "19th day of July, at your Majesty's palace, "at Westminster, for the Coronation of your "Majesty; but no directions having been issued "for the Coronation of the Queen, her Majesty "most dutifully prayed by her humble memorial "in maintenance of her own rights and inherit-"ances of divers of your Majesty's subjects, "bound to perform services at the Coronation of "the Queen Consort, that your Majesty would "according to ancient usage be graciously pleased "to appoint the same day and place, for the "Coronation of her Majesty. That in such pro-"ceedings, her Majesty fully trusted that either "her said claim would forthwith be allowed, or "that if any doubts should be entertained res-"pecting its validity, the question would be im-"mediately referred to the decision of your "Majesty in Council.

" That several days having elapsed without any " answer being sent to her Majesty's said memor- " ial, the Queen was led to apprehend that such " doubts were entertained, and her Majesty " therefore caused a second memorial to be pre- " sented to your Majesty in Council, whereby " she prayed to be heard in support of her right, " in that behalf. That it has been since intimated " to the Queen, that the prayer of the memorial " first mentioned was not to be granted, because " your Majesty's Attorney and Solicitor General, " have stated an opinion that her Majesty has no " claim of right to celebrate the ceremony of " her Coronation.

" That the Queen humbly trusts that neither " she, nor any of your Majesty's subjects, can be " debarred from the enjoyment of their rights, " by any opinion obtained from those whose " official situations would call them to resist the " claim: nor can she believe that it is your " Majesty's intention, to preclude her from as- " serting her own privileges, by advocates ap- " pointed by herself.

" That the Queen, therefore, once more solemn- " ly requires to be heard before your Majesty in " Counsel, in support of the prayer of her first- " mentioned memorial."

" C. R."

In compliance with such requisition, the King appointed a meeting of his Council, and the Law Officers of her Majesty were directed to attend.

The application of the Queen was considered and discussed. Mr. Brougham, in a speech of considerable length and of great ability, maintained the question of right, and by the clearness of his statements, the eloquence of his address, and the propriety of his historical illustrations, produced a considerable effect on the minds of many members of the Council. That Council was numerously attended during the period of the discussion, and the decision which ultimately was made on the question, was carried by a considerable majority.

To the points at issue, it will here, however, be necessary to refer, and to investigate the nature and accuracy of the claim which was made by the Queen. In the preparation of such investigation, the arguments of Mr. Brougham have been consulted, and an historic view of the matter is alone presented.

The question referred to the decision of the Privy Council was, whether or not the Queen Consort of this realm is entitled, as of *right*, to be crowned when the King celebrates the solemnity of his Coronation; and this was a question of constitutional law, to be determined by the principles which regulated public rights; it admitted, however, of illustration from those principles which regulated the rights of private persons.

In considering this question, the history of the ceremony must be examined, because Coronation is the creature of precedent, and rests rather upon

practice than principle, although the reason of it also may be traced.

There is no occasion for enquiring into the practice, when a successful warrior was held up to his followers in the field upon a buckler, and hailed as King among a crowd of soldiers, and in the necessary absence of his family. But when the solemnity assumed the form of a civil observance, the Consort appears to have shared its honours. As early as the year 784, Edelburga, the wife of Brichtrich, King of the West Saxons, having been guilty of attempts against her husband's life, the Queens of Wessex were "*deprived* of all titles, majesty, and royalty," which Spelman and Selden understand to have included Coronation, and this was effected by an express law. How long it remained in force is uncertain; but in 856, Judith, the wife of Ethelwolf, of the same kingdom, was crowned at Rheims, and afterwards received with royal honours in England. Mr. Selden, referring to the universality of the practice in all other kingdoms, says, that "the Saxon "Queens were, in the late times, crowned like "other Queens, so that the law of the West "Saxons was soon repealed, as if it were a soli- "tary exception to the general rule in those "times."

Advancing to the Kings of the Norman line, from William the Conqueror to Henry 7th, inclusive, not one of the married Kings appears to have been crowned, that had not the Coronation of his Consort celebrated at the same time, except

those who were not married at their ascension, in which case, the Queen Consort were crowned upon the celebration of their nuptials. The usage of four centuries is sufficient to establish the rule in respect of a State ceremony: it evinces the practice of England in this respect; it is sufficient to settle more essential points; it fixes the custom of the Monarchy, and authorizes the conclusion, that any subsequent deviations are to be deemed capable of explanation, in the absence of positive evidence, and to be only reckoned exceptions, even if it were shewn or granted that they cannot be explained.

Henry 8th was crowned with his first wife, Katherine; and, upon his marriage with Anne Boleyn, she was crowned alone. There may be no evidence of his other wives being crowned, any more than of the contrary position. If they were not, of which, however, no proof exists, the unsettled state of ecclesiastical affairs at that period, is sufficient to account for the omission.

The cases of Edward 6th, who died unmarried, and of Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth, have, of course, no bearing on the question. James 1st was crowned with his Queen in England, almost immediately after his accession, they having both been previously crowned in Scotland.

Charles 1st is said to have been crowned alone, though there are grounds for a contrary supposition. If that was the case, two powerful reasons may be assigned for that course.

The marriage of Charles with Henrietta Maria, a Catholic, had given extreme umbrage to the country. The Commons refused supplies, on account of grievances, particularly the growth of Popery, and the supposed leaning of the Court towards it, and the Parliament was suddenly dissolved. The Coronation took place in the interval between this dissolution and the calling of a new Parliament. It was not improbable, therefore, that one motive for not crowning the Queen was the danger of reviving alarms respecting her religion. But the tradition among antiquaries is, that she declined the ceremony unless she might be crowned by a priest of her own persuasion, which was, of course, refused. It was natural for her to regard with abhorrence a ceremony, in which the rites of the Protestant religion entered so largely; a ceremony, performed at a Protestant altar, by a Protestant prelate, in the language of a Protestant ritual. It is probable that the country, the King and the Queen, all acquiesced in the omission of the ceremony; which, however, all parties would have admitted to be her right.

Charles II. was crowned before his marriage, with Catherine of Portugal. The religious animosities of the last reign were now greatly increased. A motion in Parliament had been made, to prevent Charles's marriage with a Catholic; and the existence of scruples in Katherine's mind is on record. If then it be admitted, that she was never crowned, (of which there is no proof,)

the omission falls within the scope of the argument respecting the case of the Consort of Charles I. with this difference, that Katherine's case, however explained, or if left unexplained, does not affect the rule of a Queen being always crowned with her Consort, if married at the time of his coronation.

James II. and his Queen, Mary of Modena, were crowned together, both being Catholics. The solemnity of the sacrament is said to have been omitted on this occasion, but how the difficulties were got over which arose from the other parts of the service, seems hard to comprehend. The utmost use that can be made of their submitting to the ceremony, is unavailing against the argument respecting Henrietta, Maria, and Katherine; for that which is objeccted to by the conscience of one person may not affect the conscience of another.

Since the Revolution no exception whatever can be found to the rule; for the Consort of George I. never visited England; was not known as Queen, nor even mentioned officially at all till after her decease, and then named by the title she took after the divorce, which is understood to have dissolved her marriage before the accession of the house of Brunswick. It may be remarked, that the last proclamation issued, namely, the one directing the late Queen to be crowned, was issued some days after that which authorized the King's Coronation, the marriage having been solemnized in the interval; and it summoned all persons, bound by their tenures or other-

wise, to attend and do service at the Queen's Coronation.

The ascertainment of the facts does more in this case than lay a foundation for the argument, because every thing depends upon usage. It was agreed that in England, no Queen Consort had ever been denied a Coronation. There are, it is true, four or five instances in which no record remains of the performance of the ceremony, but it is not reasonable to infer, that because there is no record, either the one way or the other, that the ceremony in all those instances was omitted. If, however, the omission could be proved, in all those instances where no authentic record remains, it is contended that such omissions have been sufficiently accounted for. There is the greatest difference between an omission and an interruption—a mere non-usor, and a denial. An occasional omission of the exercise of a right, does not destroy that right. The King's right to be crowned might stand in the same predicament; for, although it happens that his coronation has only been omitted in one instance, that of Edward V. which is easily accounted for, the omission might well have been more frequent. The intervals between accessions and coronations have been long enough to leave many risks of the demise of the crown before the ceremony could be performed; yet, had such cases occurred, and the delay not been accounted for, the unexplained omission would not have availed against the right of future Kings. No instance whatever is alleged of the Queen having been

prevented from enjoying the honour in question. On the contrary, two attempts were made to disturb her, and both failed. Henry II. and afterwards Henry VII. delayed the coronation of their consorts, and endeavoured to withhold the ceremony altogether; but both were obliged to yield to the general usage, and those consorts were crowned. As one successful interruption would countervail many instances of uncontested usor, so one failure in the attempt to interrupt, is worth many instances of peaceable enjoyment.

If no purpose could be discovered to which the ceremony can now be subservient, or if even its original could not be traced, there would not, on that account, arise a presumption, that the Sovereign may ordain or dispense with it. He is himself the creature of the law; and in contemplation of law he has no caprice. Mere personal matters of such a nature, as plainly belong to his individual, not his corporate character, he may regulate at will; but the leaning of the law and constitution of this country is to narrow the class of those personal functions as far as possible, and to regard the natural as merging in the politic capacity. It is absurd and wholly inconsistent with every thing in the history and in the ceremony of the Queen's coronation, to suppose that it may be ordered or omitted, like a Court dinner or ball. They who maintain that it is optional, must contend that it is quite indifferent, and that it never had any meaning or importance; but they must further be prepared to shew why that alone,

of all the coronation customs, which it so nearly resembles, both in its nature and history, is both senseless and useless; for no one pretends that the King's coronation may be performed or omitted at pleasure, and yet it rests upon the same foundation of usage with the Queen's. They who rely upon the usage have no occasion to shew either the origin or the purpose of the solemnity; but then they must take all the parts of it together. They who hold one part to be necessary and the other optional, must distinguish the two; but where any thing is found so long established, the law will contend that it must have had a reasonable origin. The King's coronation, most probably, was connected with his election. He was either chosen or acknowledged upon that occasion. But it does not follow that the reception of his Queen, together with him, by his subjects, was an unimportant part of the solemnity, even if no further explanation could be given of its use—for her high rank and near connection with him might render it proper. However, the use of crowning the Consort appears to be obvious from her connection with the Royal progeny. The Coronation was the public recognition of the King as Sovereign, and of the Queen as his lawful wife, and the mother of the heirs to the crown; it was the ceremony by which the Sovereign's own title and that of his issue was authenticated. Crowning the King, acknowledged him as the rightful Monarch. Crowning the Queen, perpetuated the testimony of the

marriage, on the validity of which depended the purity of the succession to the throne; and on the undisputed acknowledgement of which depended the safety and peacefulness of that succession. The especial favourite of the law of England, as regards the Queen Consort, is, and always has been, the legitimacy of the Royal progeny. The main objects are to prevent a spurious issue from being imposed on the realm; and to remove all doubts upon this point, which, if contested, would endanger the peace of the country.

The Queen Consort's coronation is not so much a right in herself as in the realm; or rather it is a right given to her for the benefit of the realm, in like manner, as the King's rights are conferred upon him for the common weal; and hence is derived an answer to the objection, that the Queen has always enjoyed it by the favour of her Consort, who directs her to be crowned as a matter of grace. The law and constitution of this country is utterly repugnant to any such doctrine as grace or favour from the crown regulating the enjoyment of public rights. The people of these realms hold their privileges and immunities by the same title of law whereby the King holds his crown, with this difference, that the crown itself is only holden for the better maintaining those privileges and immunities; and it is absurd to contend, that a firmly established usage, well known in all ages, and subservient to important public purposes, can depend upon any thing but the law and practice of the monarchy.

The same answer may be made to the objection, that the Queen's coronation has always been solemnized by force of a proclamation from the crown, which is indeed only another form of the last objection; and is not much aided by referring to the words in the proclamation, "We have resolved to celebrate," &c. The right is not claimed adversely against the King; it has his right as well as the Queen's, that she should be crowned; or rather, it is the right of the realm by law, and the King, as executor of the law, is to see that the ceremony be performed. But this objection would disprove the existence of all rights, public and private; for without the nominal intervention of the crown, none can be enforced if resisted, and many of the most important cannot be enjoyed by the realm, or by individuals. All writs run in the King's name; not to mention judicial writs. The heir to whom a peerage is limited, cannot enjoy his highest privilege without a writ of summons to Parliament. And though this is issued by the King, and though, except by impeachment of his Ministers, there be no remedy if it be withholden, yet there can be no doubt that the subject has a right to it. So a petition of right is the subject's only remedy for the crown's intrusion upon his lands or goods. So of the right which the realm has by statute to a new Parliament, once in seven years at the least, the enactment being, that the "King, his heirs, and successor, shall with him, &c. direct legal writs to be issued under the Great Seal, for calling

and holding a new Parliament," &c. Now, in all these cases the right is not the less admitted to be in the subject, because it can only be enforced or enjoyed through the interposition of the crown. A right to that interposition is exactly part of the right in question; if it be withholden a wrong is done; and the possibility of this is so far from disproving the right, that the law will not suppose such a possibility.

This appears to be the constitutional and correct mode of viewing this question; and if it be correct, then the determination of the Privy Council, as expressed in the following resolutions, remains unaccounted for and apparently inaccurate.

At the Court at Carlton House, July 10, 1821.

PRESENT

The King's most excellent Majesty in Council.

Whereas there was this day read at the Board, a Report from a Committee of the Lords of his Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, in the the words following, viz.

" Your Majesty having been pleased by your " order in Council of thē 3d of this instant, to re- " fer unto this Committee the several Memorials " of her Majesty the Queen, claiming a right to " be Crowned, on the same day and at the same " place which has been appointed for the Corona- " tion of your Majesty; and praying to be heard " by Counsel in support of the said claim: the " Lords of the Committee, in obedience to your

" Majesty's said order of reference, have accord-
" ingly heard her Majesty's Attorney and Solicitor
" General, in support of her Majesty's said claim;
" and having also heard the observations of
" your Majesty's Attorney and Solicitor Gene-
" ral, thereupon, their Lordships do agree hum-
" bly to report to your Majesty their opinion,
" that, as it appears to them, that the Queens Con-
" sort of this realm are not entitled, as of right,
" to be crowned at any time; her Majesty the
" Queen is not entitled, as of right, to be
" crowned at the time specified in her Majesty's
" Memorial."

" His Majesty having taken the said Report into consideration, was pleased, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, to approve thereof."

(Signed) C. C. GREVILLE.

This resolution certainly created considerable disappointment, and much angry feeling. The arguments of Mr. Brougham appeared to be as unanswerable as they were unanswered; and it was, therefore, very generally expected, that her request would be allowed as a boon, if not admitted as a right.

Desirous, if possible, to believe that which she desired to be true, the Queen participated in such expectations; and her disappointment was unusually great. Still she hoped that the determination of the King, which had been so often expressed to her, might be altered, and against hope she continued to hope, that her request would be complied with.

To Lord Sidmouth she, therefore, immediately addressed the following letter, stating her determination to be present at the ceremony; and requiring that she should be properly received, and that to her a place should be assigned. The following is a copy of that communication:

Brandenburgh House, July 11th, 1821.

"My Lord,

"Your Lordship's letter of yesterday to Lord "Hood, conveyed to me the report of the Com- "mittee of Council on my Memorial to the King "in Council, claiming my right to be crowned, "and as I find the Council positively denies the "right which I have claimed, and which all "Queen Consorts have enjoyed, without one excep- "tion arising from the will of the Sovereign, I "consider it necessary to inform your Lordship, "that it is my intention to be present at the cere- "mony, on the 19th, the day fixed for his Ma- "jesty's Coronation; and I, therefore, demand "that a suitable place may be appointed for me."

(Signed) "Caroline R."

"To the Right Hon. Viscount Sidmouth."

In addition to that letter, her Majesty signed the following Protest against the decision of the Privy Council, which was prepared by her legal advisers, and transmitted to Government:—

" CAROLINE REGINA.

" *To the King's Most Excellent Majesty.—The*
" *Protest and Remonstrance of Caroline Queen*
" *of Great Britain and Ireland.*

" Your Majesty having been pleased to refer
" to your Privy Council the Queen's memorial,
" claiming, as of right, to celebrate the ceremony
" of her Coronation on the 19th day of July, being
" the day appointed for the celebration of your
" Majesty's Royal Coronation; and Lord Viscount
" Sidmouth, one of your Majesty's principal
" Secretaries of State, having communicated to
" the Queen the judgment pronounced against her
" Majesty's claim; in order to preserve her just
" rights, and those of her successors, and to pre-
" vent the said minute being in after-times re-
" ferred to, as deriving validity from her Majesty's
" supposed acquiescence in the determination
" therein expressed, the Queen feels it to be her
" bounden duty to enter her most deliberate and
" solemn protest against the said determination;
" and to affirm and maintain, that by the laws,
" usages, and customs of this realm, from time
" immemorial, the Queen Consort ought of right
" to be crowned at the same time with the King's
" Majesty.

" In support of this claim of right, her Majesty's
" law officers have proved before the said Council,
" from the most ancient and authentic records, that
" Queen Consorts of this realm have, from time im-
" memorial, participated in the ceremony of the
" Coronation with their royal husbands. The few

" exceptions that occur demonstrate, from the
" peculiar circumstances in which they originated,
" that the right itself was never questioned,
" though the exercise of it was from necessity sus-
" pended, or from motives of policy declined.

" Her Majesty has been taught to believe, that
" the most valuable laws of this country depend
" upon, and derive their authority from custom;
" that your Majesty's royal prerogatives stand
" upon the same basis: the authority of ancient
" usage cannot therefore be rejected, without
" shaking that foundation upon which the most
" important rights and institutions of the country
" depend. Your Majesty's Council, however,
" without controverting any of the facts or reasons
" upon which the claim made on the part of her
" Majesty has been supported, have expressed
" a judgment in opposition to the existence of
" such right. But the Queen can place no con-
" fidence in that judgment, when she recollects
" that the principal individuals by whom it has
" been pronounced, were formerly her successful
" defenders; that their opinions have waved with
" their interest, and that they have since become
" the most active and powerful of her persecutors;
" still less can she confide in it, when her Majesty
" calls to mind, that the leading members of that
" Council, when in the service of your royal father,
" reported, in the most solemn form, that docu-
" ments reflecting upon her Majesty were satis-
" factorily disproved as to the most important
" parts, and that the remainder were undeserving

" of credit. Under this declared conviction, they " strongly recommended to your Majesty's royal " father to bestow his favour upon the Queen, " then Princess of Wales, though in opposition " to your Majesty's declared wishes. But when " your Majesty had assumed the kingly power, " these same advisers, in another minute of " Council, recanted their former judgment, and " referred to and adopted these very same docu- " ments, as a justification of one of your Majesty's " harshest measures towards the Queen—the " separation of her Majesty from her affectionate " and only child.

" The Queen, like your Majesty, descended " from a long race of Kings, was the daughter of " a sovereign house, connected by the ties of " blood with the most illustrious families in " Europe, and her not unequal alliance with your " Majesty was formed in full confidence, that the " faith of the King and the People was equally " pledged to secure to her all those honours and " rights which had been enjoyed by her royal " predecessors.

" In that alliance her Majesty believed that she " exchanged the protection of her family for that " of a royal husband, and of a free and noble- " minded nation. From your Majesty, the Queen " has experienced only the bitter disappointment " of every hope she has indulged. In the attach- " ment of the people, she has found that powerful " and decided protection which has ever been her " steady support and her unfailing consolation.

" Submission from a subject to injuries of a private " nature may be matter of expedience—from a " wife it may be matter of necessity—but it " never can be the duty of a Queen to acquiesce " in the infringement of those rights which belong " to her constitutional character.

" The Queen does therefore repeat her most " solemn and deliberate protest against the de- " cision of the said Council, considering it only " as the sequel of that course of persecution " under which her Majesty has so long and so " severely suffered, and which decision, if it is to " furnish a precedent for future times, can have " no other effect than to fortify oppression with " the forms of law, and to give to injustice the " sanction of authority. The protection of the " subject, from the highest to the lowest, is not " only the true, but the only legitimate object of " all power; and no act of power can be legiti- " mate which is not founded on those principles " of eternal justice, without which law is but the " mask of tyranny, and power the instrument of " despotism.

Queen's House, July 17th.

To the Earl Marshal, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to other persons connected with the Coronation, the Queen also addressed letters, stating to each of them her determination to attend, and insist on the ceremony of Coronation. From them she received replies, acquainting her that they had received no directions to prepare

for her Coronation—that they were servants of the King, and therefore that they could not comply with her wishes, or further her designs.

Thus baffled and defeated, it was hoped by her friends that she would here rest, and that she would not carry her threats into execution. If her object was solely personal, she had done every thing which was necessary and proper. She had submitted her case to a tribunal—she had acknowledged its competency—she had there by Counsel, been heard in support of her claim—and it was disallowed. Being so disallowed, a protest was perhaps unnecessary, but at any rate a protest was all that could possibly be required; and her personal attendance at the Cathedral on the day of Coronation, was censured by all parties throughout the nation. If, as she stated, she only resorted to those measures, that posterity might not accuse her of having willingly sacrificed the rights of Queen Consorts, then by the appeal she had made to the King—to the Counsel—to the nation—and finally by the foregoing protest, she had done every thing that was necessary to give form and substance to her objections, and to rescue her character from the possibility of having the charges brought against her, which she apprehended.

But the Queen determined on personally attending at Westminster Abbey to claim admission. Some of her friends dissuaded her from the proceeding, but headless of their advice, she resolved not to relinquish her project. For her

character—her feelings—her comfort, and indeed her life—it would have been well if their advice she had followed, since it cannot be doubted but that it ultimately occasioned her death.

The morning of the 19th at length arrived. The preparations for the Coronation of the King were completed. Multitudes attended to witness it, and the pageant was splendid and attractive; but it was only a pageant, and the enormous sums which were expended in its production, rendered the measure generally obnoxious. Yet it would be improper not to admit that by multitudes it was viewed with delight, and that the higher classes of society were much interested by the spectacle.

At a very early hour in the morning, in pursuance of her resolution, the Queen proceeded to Westminster in a carriage drawn by six horses. Her approach was announced by loud acclamations, mingled with murmurs of discontent without the barrier, and accompanied with a kind of confusion and anxious agitation within. Her carriage without the least interruption passed the barrier, and proceeded to the door of Westminster Hall, where she stopped, uncertain what course to take; great confusion prevailed among the officers and soldiers on, and near the platform. Astonishment, hurry, and doubt, agitated the minds of the populace, and every heart thrilled either with pity, surprize, or disapprobation. Her Majesty, after some consideration, alighted from her carriage, and accompanied by Lord and Lady

Hood, and Lady Anne Hamilton, demanded admission—this movement produced a considerable sensation within, and the door was immediately closed. The officer on guard was summoned to the spot, and demanded her Majesty's ticket; she replied, "that she had none, and "as Queen of England, needed none." He professed his sorrow, but said, "he must obey orders, "and that he could not admit her without a "ticket." At the door of the Duchy of Lancaster, she made a similar application, but was again refused. Accompanied by her attendants she then demanded admission at a third entrance. When she arrived at the other extremity of the platform, her progress was arrested by a file of a dozen soldiers, who were ordered to form across the platform. Her Majesty then quitted it, and walked on to the House of Lords, there to repeat the same request. In the course of a few minutes she returned, and having ordered the top of her carriage to be taken down, rode off amidst the mingled hisses and acclamations of the people.

The treatment her Majesty received on the morning of this day, was to her a most severe trial, but yet she studied to conceal her feelings. When she returned from the Abbey, she sent for some friends to visit her, and she appeared to be in excellent spirits, she related to them the refusals she had met with, and said, "the people "did all they could." Mr. Brougham called upon her whilst she was breakfasting, and she

amused her party by relating anecdotes. She said, "she had put on her jewels to demonstrate "to the people that she had not sold them;" and when she was complimented for her courage, in facing so many dangers, she replied, "I never "was afraid of any thing in my life. I do not "know what fear is; I do not wish to die, but "when the moment comes I shall not fear it."

Yet though she thus feigned to be the gayest of the party during the greater part of the morning, it was evident to her intimate friends, that the transactions of that day had tended more completely to subdue her natural heroism and magnanimity, than any other occurrences which had hitherto taken place; and that the smile of satisfaction was only adopted as a veil to hide from observation, her real mortification and unhappiness. She felt that she was only nominally a Queen, and that after all the efforts which had been made by herself and others, to effect her recognition in that capacity, and the preservation of her rights, all their efforts had proved abortive, and she was nearly as much degraded as if the Bill of Pains and Penalties had passed both Houses of the Legislature.

On the 30th of July, her Majesty attended at Drury Lane Theatre. Whilst there, she was much indisposed; but could not be persuaded to retire, till the performance was over. Her mind had not recovered from the extreme disappointment and vexation which she had so lately sustained; and although on the following day she was some-

what better, she was too agitated completely to recover. Her disorder was originally obstruction of the bowels; and which, subsequently terminated in inflammation and mortification. Her physician, Dr. Holland, together with two other professional gentlemen, now attended her; and to the public it became necessary to announce her situation. The usual and every proper methods were resorted to, to effect the removal of the disorder; but on August 2nd, it was formally announced, that although the symptoms were mitigated yet that they were not removed.

On the 3rd of August, Dr. Ainslie was called in to attend her Majesty, when she was somewhat relieved by immersion in a warm bath; but it did not tend permanently to affect the complaint. Connected with the inflammation was a nausea at the stomach, which repelled both food and medicine; and which rendered it yet additionally improbable that she would be restored to health.

Towards the morning of Saturday the 4th, her Majesty obtained some sleep, and in the course of the day was able to receive a little nutriment. Mortification was, however, subsequently apprehended, and her Majesty's legal advisers attended at Brandenburgh House to assist in the arrangement of her property; and its disposition by will. During the whole of this day, pain continued accompanied by stupor; and whilst she was not worse, her health was not improved. Bulletins were now issued twice or oftener, every day, in order

to satisfy the intense anxiety of the public. Those who before developed no peculiar interest in her Majesty, or her cause, now hastened to Brandenburgh House; and the vicinity of her town residence was incessantly thronged with individuals of all classes of society, deeply interested in her welfare, and solicitous for her restoration.

His Majesty had previously quitted England, on an excursion to Ireland, and the intelligence of her illness was transmitted to him. To the Home Office, bulletins were also forwarded; yet no enquiries were ever made at Brandenburgh House respecting her, and the customary attentions, which are due to exalted rank, were from her withheld.

It would have been absurd to expect that the King or his Administration should, indeed, have been affected by the news of the illness of the Queen. For her they had long ceased to feel any interest; and though her death was, doubtless, not desired, yet it was not likely to affect their minds or hearts.

When her illness first assumed a serious character, Dr. Holland requested her permission to send for another physician, observing, that whatever might be his own individual skill, and attention; yet the public would necessarily expect in the case of a Queen, that every possible aid should be had recourse to. The Queen answered with a smile, "My dear Doctor, do what you please. If "it will be any relief to your mind, to call in as- "sistance, do so; but do not do it for my sake, I

" have no wish to live: I would rather die." From the period that her Majesty was assured of the very serious nature of her indisposition, she manifested the same kind of indifference as to death; indeed, she appeared sincerely to desire it, and even heard, with reluctance, any hopes expressed for her recovery, by her physicians and friends. " Why do you wish me to live!" she exclaimed, on one occasion, in the early part of her illness; " life to me can be nothing but a series " of sorrows and persecutions; I should be much " happier in another world than in this."

It was observed, that she desponded too much, that public opinion was in her favour, and would make her amends for all her sufferings. Her Majesty asked, " What has public opinion done for " me?" It was answered, that it produced the withdrawment of the Bill of Pains and Penalties. Her reply was prompt and firm—" What am I " the better for the failure of that Bill? if it had " passed I should have been degraded, and what " is my situation now? I have, indeed, the empty " title Queen; but am I Queen of England? Have " I the privileges, the power, the dignities of a " Queen of England? No, no! I am a mere pri- " vate person; I am not Queen of England."

On Friday, the symptoms of her Majesty's disorder had become very alarming, and the hopes of the physicians had entirely ceased. Her Will she then signed, and afterwards appeared more cheerful. Mr. Brougham expressed his hopes, that she felt herself easier and better? Her Majesty answered,

" Oh, no, my dear Mr. Brougham, I know I shall " die; and I do not at all regret it." Mr. Brougham said, that he was of a different opinion, and expected her Majesty to recover; but added, that the step she had just taken, was perfectly proper, in case of the disorder proving fatal. Her Majesty persisted in saying, that she knew she was dying. In the course of the evening, she observed, " I do not know whether I shall suffer bodily pain " in dying; but I can assure you, I shall quit this " world without regret: I have no reason to be " attached to life."

On the subject of her death she frequently conversed, and said that she anticipated her release from trouble, and her escape from the malice of her enemies. She said, that in this world, whether in England or abroad, the rancour of her persecutors would always beset her; and it was only in another world, she could look for peace and justice. To her attendants she expressed herself grateful and attached, and her sincere regret, that from the limited amount of her property, she should be unable, suitably to reward the fidelity and kindness of her Household; but, expressed her hopes that Government would remunerate them. She, also, declared herself sincerely grateful, and desired that her gratitude might be communicated to that generous portion of the people of England, whose support of her had been most steady, when most wanted; and who had been alarmed at neither the power or malice of her oppressors. " England," she exclaimed, " has cer-

" tainly been to me a land of sorrow and persecu-
" tion; but I know how to love those faithful
" English, who have always sympathized with my
" sorrow, and have done all in their power to
" defeat the malice of my persecutors."

On one occasion, she referred to the conduct of the Milan Commission, and of their co-conspirators in this country, when at length her mind appeared greatly agitated, but she exclaimed, " They have destroyed me, but I forgive them. " I die in peace with all mankind." Soon after she sent for Demont's sister, who continued in the employment of the Queen, and directed her, after her Majesty's death, to assure Demont that she had forgiven her for all the cruel falsehoods she had propagated respecting her.

The anxiety which now pervaded Hammersmith and its vicinity, on her Majesty's account, was intense, nor was the anxiety so restricted, for the road from London to Hammersmith was crowded with persons anxious to learn the precise state of the health of the Queen. Anxiously did they wait for the bulletins, and an announcement on the evening of the 5th, of her partial improvement, was hailed by the populace, and indeed all classes of society, with delight. In England, nothing similar had been manifested since the accouchement of her illustrious daughter; and even the humblest individual in the neighbourhood of Hammersmith, before he retired to rest, attended to inspect the bulletin, to ascertain the precise state of her health.

Soon after eleven o'clock on Sunday night, her Majesty enjoyed some little repose; and throughout the night, though no crisis had taken place, she was more free from actual pain, than she had previously been, on any night since the commencement of her indisposition.

Towards the morning of Monday, her Majesty again enjoyed some sleep, and it was the opinion of her physicians, that the violence of her complaint had somewhat abated. This intelligence was communicated by them, and the bulletin afforded much pleasure to all who were anxiously waiting its announcement, and indeed to the whole nation, as it afforded some hope of her Majesty's ultimate recovery.

As her Majesty appeared to be considerably improved in health, Drs. Maton, Warren, and Holland, left Brandenburgh House for London. Dr. Ainslie remained alone with the Queen.

On Sunday Dr. Baillie had been sent for to attend her Majesty, and arrived at Hammersmith on the following day. He immediately visited her. She had been raised from her bed and was sitting in an easy chair, and to him it appeared that her restoration to health was very probable.

Till nine o'clock on Monday evening the accounts given at Brandenburgh House continued to be favourable, and she had, in fact, been permitted to take a little refreshment. Yet, however, she stated that the disorder would prove fatal, but continued to speak of her dissolution with firmness and resignation.

On the evening of the 6th August her Majesty still continued apparently better, and the bulletin indicated that her symptons were of a favourable nature.

The anxiety to obtain intelligence regarding the state of her Majesty's health, was as intense on this day as upon any prior time since the commencement of her illness. The first bulletin that was published in the course of the day, gave unfeigned pleasure to the inhabitants of the metropolis, as it held out hopes to them that the crisis of her Majesty's disorder was past. In order to allay the intense anxiety under which all classes of people evidently laboured. Official bulletins were posted at Cambridge House, and at the Mansion House of the city of London. These various bulletins, and all the arrangements connected with them, were conducted by the family of Mr. Alderman Wood, the devoted attachment of all of whom to her Majesty was developed by repeated acts of kindness and attention, which she properly appreciated, and which the public have since acknowledged by their marked approbation.

Nothwithstanding the favourable opinions of the physicians, who considered her Majesty out of all danger, she assured them to the contrary, and said she felt she was dying, and thought she should expire before nine o'clock the next evening. It is very probable that she then felt the symptons of incipient mortification. Thus feeling, she determined on adding a codicil to her Will,

relative to the place of her interment. Her first wish was to be buried in the same grave with her beloved daughter. "But," she added, "I can "have little hope that the Government will grant "this wish. I desire, therefore, to be buried in "the same grave with my father and brother, at "Brunswick." When her Majesty had signed this codicil, she conversed at considerable length with Mr. Wilde. The physicians fearing the conversation might disturb her, wished to withdraw that gentleman from the room, and he, from the same motive, was anxious to leave; but her Majesty begged him to stay. "I thank my "physicians," she observed, "for their kind at-"tentions, they mean nothing but what is right: "but they do not understand my character. They "think that it agitates me to talk of death; they "are mistaken. To me, who have little pleasure "in life, it is pleasing to contemplate my approach-"ing death; and why may I not speak what I "feel?" These observations were made with great calmness and placidity.

Two circumstances which occurred at this period of her illness, strongly illustrate her conscious innocence, and the amiability of her disposition. On the 4th of August, when her professional advisers were receiving instructions respecting the disposition of her property, one of them suggested the propriety of sending a messenger to Italy to seal up her papers to prevent their falling into the hands of her enemies. "And what if they do," exclaimed her Majesty. "I have no papers that "they may not see. They can find nothing; be-

" cause there is nothing, nor ever has been, to " impeach my character." One of her legal advisers said, he was perfectly aware of that; but he could not but believe that her enemies might put there what they did not find. She replied, " I have always defied their malice, and I defy " it still."

Her Majesty had accustomed herself for some time to keep a diary, in which she entered various reflections on the events of the preceding day. In that diary she not unfrequently recorded any peculiarity of character, that had forced itself on her attention. " But," said the Queen, " the " sole purpose of this journal was to wile away " a few hours of time that sometimes hung rather " heavily, and the purpose having been answered, " it is now proper to destroy the book, especially " as, though written with no such intention, it " might cause pain, where I should grieve to create " any feeling but pleasure; I, therefore, direct " that it may be destroyed." Her directions were complied with, and the diary was committed to the flames.

The night between Monday and Tuesday was passed without sleep, in consequence of that restless anxiety which generally accompanies the process of mortification. Her Majesty's physicians were, however, not without hope of her recovery, but the bulletin, on Tuesday morning, checked the sanguine expectations which the public had formed, and no inconsiderable feeling of despondency was created, when it was learnt that the favourable symptons of the preceding

night had not increased; and that her symptons were more alarming.

Shortly after the publication of this bulletin, appearances yet more unfavourable succeeded, and the Queen suffered most acutely, but manifested her usual heroism and strength of mind, by concealing her sufferings and bearing them with patience and resignation. Opiates were now administered, and for a length of time they soothed her frame; but at two o'clock increased inflammation became visible to every one present, and the attendance of the physicians was desired with the utmost possible speed. Drs. Baillie, Maton, and Holland speedily arrived; and to the public was communicated the fact, that she was much worse.

During her long and painful illness her young protegè, William Austin, frequently visited her alone. She informed him that she had provided for his future comfort and respectability in her Will, and offered to him the most excellent advice as to the future conduct he should display. She admonished him to endeavour to gain the respect of all good men, by his upright conduct through life. "You will find kind friends in those indivi-" duals (naming some especially) who have been " faithful to me to the last; and I charge you " never to act without their advice." The last time he visited her room, she was unable to speak, but she looked at him affectionately, and pressed his hand. He was in the room during the last moments of her existence, but then she was insensible.

During the whole of her illness, her anxiety as to his future welfare and conduct, appeared nearly wholly to engross her attention, and to a friend she said, "I know his faults as well as any one— "they are all my faults, poor fellow, not his; and "I hope he will conduct himself well through life."

Opiates could only now be administered to induce repose, and by such means to alleviate as much as possible the sufferings of the royal patient, and to blunt the acuteness of the shaft of death.—The awful crisis was, however, fast approaching, and it excited universal surprize, that in the last stage of the disease her life should be so long protracted. But while on the countenances of all who surrounded her, the look of cloudy apprehension was depicted, her Majesty displayed great serenity, and even cheerfulness.

Between four and five o'clock, Mr. Wilde was summoned to the chamber of death—an alarming alteration had already taken place in the appearance of her Majesty, who was perfectly aware of the change—and spoke with calmness and resignation of her approaching dissolution. She hailed with joy an intimation that it would be proper that she should make any alterations she might desire in her Will, and immediately comprehended the idea before it was half expressed. "I under- "stand you perfectly, I am quite ready; send "for my lawyers."

She spent some time in calmly and deliberately giving instructions as to the management of her property, and adding a codicil to her Will; and

after signing it exclaimed, "There, now I am "ready to die."

During the latter part of her Majesty's illness, she twice expressed an anxious desire to participate in the HOLY SACRAMENT, and for that purpose the Rev. Mr. Atwood, of Hammersmith, was summoned to Brandenburgh House; but the fatal change in her Majesty's disorder taking place, her intentions were frustrated.

To a friend who entered her room, she observed, "My true friends ought not to weep for me, as "I am going to be much happier, and I had "nothing worth living for in this world. I have "no wish to live, and I hail death with joy." She then enquired after all her friends by name, and wished to see them, and regretted her inability to reward all those who had been so faithful and kind to her. "I freely forgive all my ene-"mies (she continued), and hope something will "be done for all those of my Household, whom it "is not in my power to reward."

The dangerous state of her Majesty having been publicly divulged, Dr. Lushington, Mr. Hobhouse, the Hon. D. Kennaird, and many other personal friends of the Queen, hastened to Hammersmith, and messengers arrived from their Royal Highnesses the Duchess of Kent and the Duke of Sussex.

About four o'clock, an accession of fever came on, which, operating on a frame already almost exhausted, produced, for a short time, a greater exuberance of spirits than had before been manifested; when she expressed herself with more

vehemence of manner, but with the same forbearance of language, relative to the cruel conspiracies of her inveterate foes; but the fever subsiding, she recovered her usual tone and manners. Stupor then rapidly succeeded, and which lasted till nearly eight o'clock; when, on awakening, she observed Dr. Holland by her bed-side, who had frequently expressed a hope of her recovery. She said to him with a smile, "Well, my dear "Doctor, what do you think now." A short time before her death, she said to a female attendant, "The doctors do not understand my malady; it "is here, (laying her hand upon her heart); but "I will be silent; my lips will never make it "known."

The physicians now remained at Brandenburgh House till some decided alteration had taken place. Every symptom of approaching dissolution was now manifested, and the continued existence of spasmodic affection convinced her attendants, that nature must soon give up the struggle, and that a frame, already exhausted by suffering of mind and body, must sink under the pressure of such accumulated ills. Their apprehensions were correct; for, after sleeping for some time, her eyes became fixed, her muscles rigid, and a stupor ensued, from which she never awoke; and, at twenty-five minutes after ten o'clock, on August 7th, 1821, expired the Queen Consort of George IV.

The knowledge of the fact by the household excited grief the most poignant and vehement. To her Majesty her domestics were unquestionably

devotedly attached, and the loss was to them irreparable. The nation sympathized with them. Her enemies sighed at her sufferings, and her friends wept at her wrongs. National regret was indeed intense; and now she was departed, all feelings were lost in the general sentiments of pity and sorrow.

On her conduct during her last illness, a few observations should be made. It may be said, she did not fear death—but did she anticipate the bliss of Heaven? To this it is replied, she expressed herself certain of future happiness, though she did not communicate the grounds of her confidence. To the Christian Religion, to the Protestant Faith, and to the Lutheran Church, she was certainly attached, and in her last moments she at least evinced one of the distinguishing precepts of Christianity, by forgiving her enemies. Of her creed it is indeed difficult to speak. She was a friend to universal toleration, but whether it arose from indifference, or purely from principle, or from mixed causes, it is not very easy to determine. Her kindness, benevolence, and generosity cannot possibly be doubted, and to the education of the poor, and the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures, she always expressed herself a friend. But as to the precise state of her religious feelings, or the nature of her faith, nothing is distinctly known, as she always considered religion as an affair between the creature and the Creator.

Common honesty has demanded that these ob-

servations should be made, and the christian candour of all parties will be best displayed, by allowing her conduct to be the test of her principles, and by hoping that as she acted with so much kindness, generosity, and benevolence, to the creature, she was not unmindful of the obligations which she owed to her Creator.

The intelligence of the death of her Majesty was immediately transmitted to the King and his Government. The former received it without emotions either of a painful or of a pleasing nature. To him it was an event wholly unexpected; and to him it was almost unimportant. He did not love or respect her. The former passion he had never pretended to feel, and the latter sentiment could not be cherished by him, if he considered her guilty of the crimes which had been alleged against her, and which he certainly did not totally discredit. During the period, however, which elapsed between her death and the removal of her corpse to Brunswick, his Majesty did not appear in public, and refrained from any expressions as to her character. Not with equal propriety, however, did some agents of the Government, or even members of the Administration conduct themselves. The knell which proclaimed her decease, only fanned into a flame the expiring embers of party aversion, and induced her enemies again to revive the charges of Lady Douglas, and of the Milan Commission.

Before proceeding to narrate the circumstances connected with the interment of her Majesty,

it will be proper to insert her Will, as preparatory to any observations on the manner in which her wishes were attended to.

" This is the last WILL and TESTAMENT of me,
" Caroline, Queen Consort of the United King-
" dom of Great Britain and Ireland:—

" I revoke all former wills.

" I constitute and appoint Stephen Lushington,
" Doctor of Laws, and Thomas Wilde, Esq. Bar-
" rister at Law, trustees and executors of this
" my will.

" In execution of all powers given me by the
" will of my late mother, Augusta Duchess of
" Brunswick-Lunenburgh, I appoint, limit, give,
" devise, and bequeath to my said trustees, all
" my right, title, and interest under the said will,
" and also all the rest of my property, real and
" personal, debts and effects, of whatsoever na-
" ture or kind soever, and wheresoever situate,
" upon trust, to receive and collect the same;
" and, when collected, convert into money, and
" invest it at their discretion in the funds of the
" United Kingdom, or otherwise; and, upon fur-
" ther trust, to pay the principal of the whole of
" the said trust property to William Austin, who
" has been long under my protection, on his
" attaining the age of twenty-one years; and, in
" the mean time, to pay the interest and pro-
" ceeds of the same, or so much thereof as to

" them may seem meet, towards the maintenance,
" and education of the same William Austin; and
" I do declare that my said trustees and execu-
" tors shall not be chargeable in respect of the
" default of each other, or of any agent employ-
" ed by them or either of them, but only for
" their own respective receipts, acts, and wilful
" defaults. I also give and bequeath to my said
" executors, to be disposed of according to their
" will and pleasure, all and every my documents,
" manuscripts, papers, writings, and memoranda,
" wheresoever being at the time of my death."

" CAROLINE R." (Seal.)

" Signed, sealed, and published this 3rd day
" of August, in the year 1821, at Brandenburgh
" House, in the presence of

" H. BROUGHAM,
" THOMAS DENMAN,
" HENRY HOLLAND, M.D.
" HOOD.

" This is a codicil to my Will, dated this 3rd
" day of August:—

" I give all my clothes here and in Italy, to
" Mariette Brun. I direct that a particular box,
" by me described, be sealed with my seal, and
" delivered to Mr. Obichini, of Coleman Street,
" merchant; and I acknowledge that I owe him
" £4,300. I wish that Government would pay
" the £15,000, the price of my House in South

"Audley Street. I desire to be buried at Brunswick. I leave my coach to Stephen Lushington, my executor; my landaulet to John Hieronymus.

"CAROLINE R."

Witnesses,

"HOOD,
"H. BROUGHAM,
"T. DENMAN,
"HENRY HOLLAND, M. D.

"This is a codicil to my last will:—

"I give to John Hieronymus, and Marietta Brun, all my bed and table linen, which has already been used. I give to Louis Brun, the sum of £1,000, and an annuity of £150 per annum, payable half yearly. I give the large picture of myself and the daughters, to the Cardinal Alberoni. The [illegible] myself to Lady Anne Hamilton. I give the picture of myself which is a copy of that [illegible] to the City of London, in my possession [illegible] Lushington. There are two [illegible] ing, of which I request [illegible] which is also [illegible] remaining one to William [illegible] the Vicomte and [illegible] I have already given to John [illegible] carriage. I also give him the other [illegible] rings. I desire that my [illegible] mother's will [illegible] specific [illegible]

" body be not opened, and that three days after " my death, it be carried to Brunswick for in- " terment; and that the inscription upon my " coffin be—" Here lies Caroline of Brunswick, " the injured Queen of England."

" CAROLINE R."

" Signed in the presence of

" HENRY HOLLAND, M. D.

August 5th, 1821.

" A codicil to my last Will:—

" I give and bequeath to William Austin, all " my plate and household furniture at Branden- " burgh House, and also all unused linen.

" I direct my executors to make application to " his Majesty's Government to pay to them such " sum of money, as at the time of my decease I " may have paid, or which they may be called " upon to pay, for the purchase of my House in " South Audley Street; and I give and bequeath " —— sum of money, as my said executors shall " procure and obtain in that respect, unto them " my said executors, in trust for William Austin, " according to the provisions of my will: such " sum to be considered a specific legacy. And in " case the Government shall refuse to repay such " sum, I direct my executors to sell my interest " in the said House, and also the furniture and " things therein. And I give and direct the pro- " ceeds thereof to be paid and applied to and for " the use of the said William Austin, in like " manner, as a specific legacy; but in case the

" Government shall repay the purchase money of " the said House, in that case, the proceeds which " may be realized by the sale, are to fall into the " general residue of my estate. Dated the 7th " day of August, 1821."

" CAROLINE, R."

Witness, HENRY U. THOMSON,
Kensington.

Without entering into an uninteresting and unimportant controversy, relative to the interment of her Majesty, and entering into details wholly unnecessary, it must be here recorded, that the corpse of her Majesty was too speedily removed from Hammersmith—that the arrangements made by Government respecting her interment, were too rapidly devised and executed—that the feelings of her domestics and friends were not properly respected—and that the remains of the illustrious dead were not treated with that respect to which at any rate her rank and station entitled them.

The 18th of August was fixed on, as the day when her corpse should be conveyed to Harwich, and from thence to Brunswick. In vain did her friends protest against the arrangements —in vain did they urge the personal inconvenience which they should sustain—the orders were imperative, and they were obeyed.

The morning of the day arrived. All the streets of the metropolis were crowded—though the rain descended in torrents; but the line of pro-

cession of the funeral was unknown. Her Majesty's Executors in vain endeavoured to obtain information from the agents of the Government, or even from Lord Liverpool, and it was not till the morning of the funeral, that the following directions were communicated by the conductor of the procession.

"The funeral cavalcade to pass from the Gate of Brandenburgh House through Hammersmith, to turn round by Kensington Gravel Pits, near the Church, into the Uxbridge Road, to Bayswater, from thence to Tyburn Turnpike, down the Edgeware Road, along the New Road to Islington, down the City Road, along Old Street, Mile End, to Romford, &c. A squadron of the Oxford Blues from Brandenburgh House to Romford, to attend the procession; a squadron of the Light Dragoons from Romford to Chelmsford; another squadron of the same regiment, from Chelmsford to Colchester, and another escort from Colchester to Harwich, where a Guard of honour is waiting."

By this route the city of London was designed to be avoided, public curiosity to be ungratified, and public sympathy and grief to be disregarded. But the populace, apprized of the intentions of Government, to take the corpse along bye roads, and out of the direct line, determined to prevent this last act of disrespect to their late persecuted and unhappy Queen. The propriety of such determination may, indeed, be questioned; but the conduct of Government in resolving on the measure which gave such general offence, and which afterwards occasioned such serious evils, cannot

be censured in terms too marked or decisive. When the funeral arrived at the Gravel Pits of Kensington, the road had been previously blocked up by the people, with waggons; and the pavement was also torn up, additionally, to render certain its obstruction. After a short contest between the police officers and the people, the director of the procession, finding all attempts to pass that way fruitless, sent to Government for orders, or for assistance.

After continuing there for some time, the procession proceeded in the direct road to Hyde Park. Here an attempt was made to cross the Park, and by that method to reach the North Western Road, which would have been equivalent to proceeding by the Kensington Gravel Pits. The Park gate had, however, been blocked up, and after some vain efforts to force it open, the procession moved on to Hyde Park Corner. In addition to a Guard of Honour accompanying the corpse, a reinforcement of Life Guards had been obtained, and with some difficulty the hearse was conveyed through the Park gate at this place; leaving the principal part of the procession in the rear. After crossing the Park with considerable speed, the next difficulty was to force the gate on the opposite side. At this place a general conflict ensued, and the Park wall was pulled down for a considerable distance, to supply weapons for the people. At this spot two persons, named HONEY and FRANCIS, were shot by the soldiers; and over their remains Coroner's Inquests were, subsequently, held;

when, as to one of them, the Jury returned a verdict of Manslaughter, and as to the other, of Wilful Murder, against some of the Life Guards, whose names were unknown. As, however, the transactions which took place on that day, and which were afterwards investigated before Juries, may become the subject of legal Inquiry, it would be improper, because unjust to the accused, to investigate too minutely the conduct of the soldiers; yet it cannot be denied, that unnecessary force was by them exerted, and the most violent and intemperate measures were adopted.

The Life Guards, at this place were, however, victorious, and the corpse reached the New Road, Paddington; on which it proceeded, without further interruption, till it reached Tottenham Court Road. There the same system of obstruction with carts, waggons, drays and hackney coaches, was resorted to, and the further progress of the procession along the line, designed by Government, was impossible, without the destruction of many lives; and, indeed, without the introduction of artillery.

Yet, because the Chief Magistrate of the Police acted with humanity and propriety, and ultimately yielded to the wishes of the people, rather than improperly sacrifice the lives of his fellow subjects, it has been necessary for him to resign; and Sir Robert Wilson, a General of distinguished valour and intrepidity, and who has fought with singular success in behalf of the liberties of Europe, has been deprived of his Commission, for

attending at the funeral of her Majesty, and for protesting against the indiscriminate firing of the soldiers.

The English nation, however, has rightly felt the injurious operation, which such a measure was likely to produce; and by a public subscription, will speedily ensure to him the same yearly income that he would have received if he had not been so deprived.

The case of Sir Robert Wilson is one, indeed, of peculiar importance; and, as a soldier, he has received the thanks of most of the European Powers—the thanks of his country, and of his King; and against his personal character, no charges can be brought, because he has invariably conducted himself with that propriety which has ensured to him a just and general respect. Nor should it be forgotten, that his Commission was by him purchased, and that all inquiry into the alleged impropriety of his conduct has been wholly refused.

The funeral now moved on towards Temple Bar. Intelligence of the alteration in the intended route, had been given to the Lord Mayor, who hastened to meet the procession, and in virtue of his authority, directed the Life Guards not to enter the city; but the Oxford Blues he permitted to escort the corpse of her Majesty, as they had manifested great urbanity during the whole of the previous unparalleled, and distressing scenes.

Through the City the procession now advanced to Whitechapel, and from thence to Stratford, Bow, and Romford.

A description of the procession has been previously omitted, in order to prevent any want of connection in the narrative; but it is now necessary that it should be inserted. The following is a description of the procession when it quitted Brandenburgh House:—

Beadle of Hammersmith, at the head of Latimer's School Charity Children, who strewed the way with flowers.

Pages, three and two.

Oxford Blues, three and two.

Four Mutes, two and two.

First Mourning Coach and Six,
containing the servants of her Majesty's Chamberlain, and Longuez, the black.

Second Mourning Coach and Six,
containing Mr. Wilde's male and female servants, and a servant of Sir George Nayler.

Mutes and Pages, two and two.

His Majesty's eight Deputy Marshals, two and two, in state, on horseback.

Twelve Pages on horseback, two and two, with black cloaks and hatbands.

Two Oxford Blues.

Her late Majesty's State Carriage, with six horses,
containing Sir George Nayler, in his state dress as Clarencieux King of Arms, accompanied by Mr. Hood, the Herald.

[Sir George carried the Crown and Cushion from the state apartment to the door, and having got into the carriage, they were placed on his lap by the Herald, who afterwards took a seat by his side, with their backs towards the horses. The Cushion was about two feet long, and one foot wide—black velvet, edged with gold fringe, and a large gold tassel at each of the four corners. It was an Imperial Crown which was carried upon the cushion.]

Two of her Majesty's state servants behind the carriages.

Squadron of Horse,
two and two, attended by their commanding officer.

HEARSE WITH EIGHT BLACK HORSES.

Three Pages. THE BODY. Three Pages.

[Each side of the hearse was decorated with an escutcheon. Postilions in black rode upon the two leading horses. At the end of the hearse was an imperial crown with the letters C. R. The horses in the coaches also were decorated with large black feathers.]

Four Soldiers, two and two, with flag.
Trumpeter.
Eighteen Soldiers, two and two.
Third Mourning Coach and Six,
containing James Thomas, Esq. of the Lord Chamberlain's office, with a gentleman in the same department.
Fourth Mourning Coach and Six,
in which was alone Lord Hood, Her Majesty's Chamberlain.
Fifth Mourning Coach and Six,
containing Lady Hood and Lady Anne Hamilton.
Sixth Mourning Coach and Six,
containing Dr. Lushington and his Lady.
Seventh Mourning Coach and Six,
prepared for Mr. and Mrs. Wilde.
Eighth Mourning Coach and Six.
containing Mr. Alderman Wood and Count Vassali.
Ninth Mourning Coach and Six.
containing Captain Hesse and Mr. Wilson (son of Sir Robert,) her late Majesty's Equerries, with the Rev. Mr. Wood, her Majesty's Chaplain, and Mr. William Austin.
Tenth Mourning Coach and Six,
containing Lieutenants Hownam and Flynn, with two other gentlemen belonging to the household.

Eleventh Mourning Coach and Six,
containing Mr. Hieronymus, her Majesty's Steward, Mariette Brun, (De Mont's sister,) Lady Hood's female servant, and Lady Anne Hamilton's.
Twelfth Mourning Coach and Six,
containing her Majesty's three Pages, Mr. Melburn, Mr. Adolphus, and Mr. Nicolini.
Sheriff Waithman's carriage.
Thirteenth Mourning Coach,
containing Mr. Bailey, and two other gentlemen, who accompanied the procession to Brunswick, to see the last rites performed over the body of her Majesty, according to his instructions from the British government.
Escort of Pages and Gentlemen residing in Hammersmith.
A carriage with a servant, containing luggage belonging to the different persons in the cavalcade.
Two Highland Officers in a chaise.
A Page.
The carriages of the different Gentlemen, friends of her late Majesty.

But to return: no language can adequately express the *universal* and unparalleled interest excited by the funeral of her Majesty. From Hammersmith to Romford, a distance of upwards of twenty miles, not only the direct, but cross-roads were lined for the whole day with anxious and waiting spectators. The Mart and the 'Change were wholly unfrequented—the Shops were closed—the bells mournfully tolled—mourning dresses were generally worn—the day was rainy and drear, and in one word the past history of the Country, cannot probably supply any fact which created feelings; occasioned scenes; and effected results,

so distressing as the death and interment of her Majesty.

It is impossible to describe in terms too powerful, the immense number of spectators, drawn together on this occasion, from all parts of the country; either by sympathy or curiosity. The City of London presented a scene of activity and bustle, and great masses of the people hastened from spot to spot, according to the rumours, which were received relative to the route of the procession. It was, therefore, particularly improper in the members of the administration to endeavour by any proceeding to prevent the gratification of curiosity so intense, and sympathy so sincere; yet however, it must be admitted, that the populace should have coincided, rather than by their determination, have occasioned the sacrifice of human life, and the multitudinous evils which subsequently ensued. Still the wishes of the nation, when not inconsistent with its peace and happiness, are not to be disregarded by those who for the time have been entrusted with the management of the state. There could be no possible reason why the funeral procession should not follow the route which was desired, not only by her Majesty's Executors and her private friends; but, also, by thousands of her subjects. If such line of conduct had been adopted, the sacrifice of human life might have been spared, the public peace would have remained undisturbed, and the harmless and natural wishes of the population of the metropolis would have been gratified.

The route through the city was along Fleet-street and Ludgate-hill, through Cheapside, Cornhill, and Whitechapel. The representatives of various public companies followed to this place, and marched in ranks, with banners and emblems of their professions. These were, indeed, constituted principally of the poorer classes of society, but amongst the number were men of great respectability. The procession moved slowly on through Bow, Stratford, and Ilford, to Romford, where it was determined that the principal persons of her Majesty's suite should stay at that place during the night; but that the corpse should be conveyed to Chelmsford. At every town the procession was received with every possible demonstration of respect; and at the last-mentioned place, the coffin was conveyed to the church, and there followed by the members of her household. On the succeeding day, the procession continued its progress to Harwich. On the second day, they arrived at Colchester. At this place in conformity with the directions of her Majesty's Will, the Executors placed on the coffin a plate, containing the inscription which she desired. That plate was, however, removed by the direction of the agent of the Government, and the usual latin inscription was substituted. At this place the interest of the public was equally manifested, and every suitable mark of respect was shewn by the inhabitants. On the following day the procession advanced to Harwich, and at noon arrived at that place. It was met by a detachment of the 86th,

but the procession was conducted in a manner so disorderly and improper, that on its entrance it excited astonishment and indignation. A small advanced guard of cavalry preceded; Mr. Chittenden, the undertaker, on a lame horse, headed ten undertakers on horseback. Then followed three mourning coaches and six, one of which contained the real directors of this singular procession. Mr. Bailey was the head undertaker, and Mr. Thomas the deputy of the then non-existent Lord Chamberlain. About twenty-five cavalry, 4th dragoons, followed. Then succeeded her Majesty's own carriage, drawn by six bay horses, containing Sir George Nayler, his companion, the cushion and crown: the crown, which was a tawdry bauble decorated with beads, strung round in a manner that would have disgraced a country stage. Then followed the hearse, drawn by eight black horses, without plumes on the horses, and with only a few paltry feathers on the hearse. No plateaus of plumes carried, as is the case at almost all respectable funerals. The royal arms were still left upon the hearse, but all the escutcheons were removed from the horses. No attendance of heralds or marshal's-men. Nine mourning coaches, containing Lord Hood, Lady Hood, and Lady Anne Hamilton, and those of her Majesty's family before enumerated, then followed, and the appearance of the carriages, horses and drivers, surprised or disgusted every beholder. Then followed the private carriage of Mr. Brougham, containing himself and Sir Robert Wilson,

and Mr. Hume and Mr. Hobhouse, in another carriage, succeeded. A few other carriages continued the scene, and a detachment of dragoons closed the whole.

Nothing could possibly be more disrespectful, and therefore improper, than the conduct of Government and its agents during the whole of this singular and unheard of spectacle. The good sense and right feelings of all who had even been opposed to her among the people, were shocked at such proceedings, and by all parties the conduct of ministers was disapproved.

The procession thus entered the town. The dragoons preceding played the *Dead March in Saul* on their trumpets. The infantry, with arms reversed, took up the tune, going before the cavalry. The infantry had one stand of colours, the cavalry two standards, and without a moment's pause in the town, the procession arrived at the jetty for the embarkation of the corpse. The troops drew up, opened their ranks, and formed a line on each side. Mr. Chittenden and his ten men dismounted; and it then, for the first time, appeared that the body was to be instantly removed. Without detailing the particulars of the embarkation, during the whole of which the most marked disrespect was manifested to her Majesty's remains, and to all her friends; the body was deposited in the Glasgow frigate, for the purpose of conveying it to Brunswick.

A short time afterwards Lord and Lady Hood, Lady Ann Hamilton, Dr. and Mrs. Lushington,

Count Vassali, and Mr. Austin, sailed in one of the boats of a schooner in the offing, and immediately proceeded to the vessel which was ready to receive them.

Long before the funeral arrived at Harwich, the beech was filled with spectators, and the river was covered with boats, assembled to witness the conclusion of the mournful scene.

When the coffin was lowered down into the boat, it was observed that the friction occasioned by the indecent rapidity with which it was hurried along the road, had rent off the crimson velvet which was placed there for the purpose of ornament. On the crown being lowered into the boat, it immediately proceeded to the Pioneer schooner, and was followed at a small distance by nuumbers of the boats which had been previously stationed around the Jetty, and of which several had arrived from the neighbouring ports. The coffin on the boats reaching the schooner, was hoisted on board and received by a party of marines with their arms reversed.

The schooner reached the Glasgow frigate at half past four o'clock, the other ships composing the funeral squadron immediately weighed anchor, and proceeded to join the Glasgow, the wind was favorable for Germany, and the squadron arrived at Cuxhaven on Sunday the 19th, and anchored in the harbour. The Glasgow was no sooner moored, than preparations, which had been previously arranged, were made for the removal of her Majesty's remains to a smaller vessel, suited to the navigation of the

Elbe, and the Gannet sloop of war was appointed for this purpose, and to it the coffin was with proper solemnity transferred.

The Gannet accompanied by the Wye, then sailed up the Elbe for Stade, where it arrived on Monday. Thousands of persons were assembled on the banks of the narrow river to witness the arrival of the corpse. The Wye continued to fire minute guns until the approach of the boats to Stade became visible from the fort; the Wye then ceased to fire, and the Gannet commenced firing minute guns for half an hour. The Hanoverian guard-ship immediately after fired for the same time; while the guns of the fortress announced to the inhabitants of Stade the approach of the remains of their late Queen.

At the moment the boats of the British ships approached to the draw-bridge, the bells of the three churches of the town were tolled. A procession was then formed from the chief landing place to the principal church, where a solemn dirge announced its arrival, and continued whilst the mourners remained.

The inhabitants and burghers of Stade manifested their respect for her late Majesty in a manner the most unequivocal and satisfactory. Their grief appeared to be most sincere, and they spoke of the character of her Majesty, in terms of admiration. On the following morning at an early hour the procession, somewhat altered in arrangement and improved in appearance, proceeded towards Buxtehude. At Bergen it rested for a

short time. The commandant of the place, Colonel Friegen, entered the house to condole with the illustrious mourners, but was for some time absolutely unable to speak from emotion. At length in a few words, he stated, that in the very room which they then occupied, he had, in the same month seven years before, received the Queen of England when she came to meet her brother, the late Duke of Brunswick. He spoke of her character in terms of respect, and several of the inhabitants united in the praises he bestowed.

At this place also the hussars who accompanied the funeral were relieved by a guard of cuirassiers; and the entrance of the cavalcade into Celle was marked by demonstrations of the highest regard and attention. The authorities met the procession. The bells were tolled; the streets were lined with soldiers, girls strewed flowers before the hearse; and the coffin being carried into the great church of the city, was placed (by a singular coincidence,) upon the tomb of the unfortunate sister of George III., Matilda Queen of Denmark. At Buxtehude the procession rested for the night.

On the 24th of August it arrived at Offau, and was met by the Count Aldenslaben, grand Chamberlain of the Court. He intimated to Lord Hood and Dr. Lushington, that he wished to make arrangements for the interment, which was to take place upon the same evening. They resisted such proposal, as it appeared to them inconsistent with the respect which was due to the remains of the illustrious deceased; but, he stated, that it

had been the invariable custom in the family of the Dukes of Brunswick to bury at midnight, and that his orders had been imperative. It was then agreed that the principal mourners should instantly proceed to Brunswick; that the funeral procession should follow so as to arrive at ten at night at the gates of the city; and that, at that time, the personages attending and officiating should go out to meet it. This arrangement was accordingly carried into effect; and, at ten o'clock at night the hearse arrived at the outer barrier.

Though the inhabitants had not received any intimation that her Majesty's remains were to be buried in the tomb of her ancestors till the evening preceding their arrival; yet, the enthusiastic regard of the Brunswickers for the deceased Queen, was so sincere, that the whole population of forty thousand souls, simultaneously resolved to demonstrate their affectionate attachment.

It should not here be forgotten, that Mr. Alderman Wood arrived at Brunswick before the other mourners—travelled alone, and at his own expence, and materially assisted in conducting the preparatory arrangements. According to the arrangements which had been previously acceded to, the corpse was met by the mourners at eleven o'clock at night—the coffin was deposited on a magnificent open car—and the car was drawn by the citizens. The mourners followed in coaches, and the whole was conducted by torch light to the burial place of royalty. The road along

which it proceeded, was wide and open, yet it was crowded by the inhabitants—the most solemn silence reigned—the front lines of this assemblage carried torches; and on double rows of willows on each side the road were suspended lamps of various colours. The procession then moved slowly towards the town; and, as the clock struck twelve, reached the inner barrier. Here the mourners descended from the carriages, and the whole cortege now proceeded on foot, with the exception of Sir George Nayler, who remained in the first carriage. Along the town the procession slowly advanced, accompanied by a detachment of Brunswick cavalry. No female was however seen in the streets. They were only spectators at the windows of the houses. The arrangements were proper and suitable; and the interest evinced by the Brunswickers demonstrated that the old had not forgotten her kindness when young; and that, as the young had heard of her charity and benevolence, when a Princess of Brunswick, they now deplored her loss.

As the corpse passed along the aisle into the place of sepulture, a hundred young ladies of the first families in Brunswick, dressed in white, stood on each side, and scattered flowers before it, In a few seconds the coffin, and the mourners had all arrived in the family vault of the illustrious House of Brunswick. The entire space is very large, and already contains fifty-seven coffins of different branches of that ancient family. A por-

tion, about seven yards square, was separated from the rest by hangings of black cloth, and was illuminated with wax lights. In the middle of this section stood a platform, raised about two feet from the ground: on one side of which was the coffin of the celebrated Duke of Brunswick, and at the foot was the coffin of the gallant brother of her Majesty, who was killed at Quatre Bras.

No funeral service was read over her Majesty, nor were any directions given as to the ceremony, but the intelligent and excellent Minister of religion, the Reverend Mr. Wolff, in the most solemn and devout manner offered up the following prayer.

" Transient is our life, perishable all the fortune " and glory of the earth! Thus, all-wise God, " thou hast ordained it: but in death are termin- " ated all the hardships, troubles, and sufferings, " that attend the life of man in this state of im- " perfection. Not in this world where we are " strangers, where we live in a constant struggle " with adversities and even our infirmities: no! " only in that to come, for which thou hast " created our immortal spirit, do we find the " desired felicity, and purer untroubled unperish- " able joys. Penetrated even in the inmost re- " cesses of our hearts, by this solemn and con- " soling truth, we elevate with pious devotion our " hearts to thee, the Infinite One! in this sacred " place, and at the coffin of a deceased whom " thy all-wise will once destined for a terrestrial

" throne, and now, after a rare change of destiny,
" didst call into the land of eternal peace. With
" hearts deeply affected do we view the burying
" place of this descendant of a beloved and
" princely family. Thou, her benign Creator
" didst adorn her with high advantages of mind
" and body, and didst bestow upon her a heart
" full of clemency and benignity: thy providence
" placed her where she could, and was resolved
" to do much good, to the honour of her high
" family, and for the weal of the country whose
" Princess she was. Unsearchable, O eternal,
" are thy ways: after a transient and troublesome
" life, she has now finished her earthly career,
" and her inanimate body returns to the vault,
" where her ever memorable father, her brother,
" and her relations, are resting.

" Almighty God, with elevated hearts we
" glorify thy grace, for all the benefits thou hast
" given to the deceased during her life, and we
" infinitely revere thy wisdom, in the present
" termination of her severe trials: whereby after
" thy most benign intention she should be puri-
" fied of human infirmities, and be prepared for
" a better life. Thanks to thee for the comfort
" thou hast richly granted her in her last hours,
" thanks for the rare strength thou didst inspire
" her with, both in her life, and in her last
" moments, to a patient and courageous suffer-
" ance of her grievances; thanks for the hope
" strengthened in her soul, wherewith, full of
" desire and serenity of faith, she passed from

" a mortal to an immortal life. Now may her " released soul enjoy the peaceful and blissful tran- " quility, which this world cannot grant: and may " thy grace, thou all just and most righteous " Lord, recompense her in that state of perfection, " for what was but deficient here on earth. But " to us let her ever-memorable remembrances be " a moving and beneficial lesson, thus to believe, " thus to hope, thus to live, that we may once " courageously pass over to the life of just requital. " And now, most gracious God, preserve to us " graciously the remaining most beloved members " of our princely family, for our joy and for the " welfare of our country, and attend their days " with thy richest blessing. Grant our most pious " wishes! Amen."

The Mourners then separated. For them the inhabitants of Brunswick expressed the most sincere respect, and demonstrated by their conduct, that they appreciated their attachment to the Queen. They returned to this country; and they were greeted on their return. The loss of her Majesty was widely and sincerely felt. Funeral sermons were delivered in various places of worship, some of which have been subsequently printed. Her friends yet constitute an overwhelming majority in the nation; the conduct of the government towards her is yet censured by multitudes; inquiry into their conduct is by some even yet demanded, and may possibly become the subject of Parliamentary inquiry. Efforts are still making to injure in reputation, happiness or property,

her friends and adherents; and those who defended her whilst living, or who have vindicated her since dead, have become the objects of ministerial aversion, and will be exposed to all the evils of a misdirected and improper inveteracy.

By some, indeed, the cause of the Queen was only made an instrument of political discontent, and entirely a party question; but such feelings are gradually subsiding; the questions are beginning to be calmly and properly discussed, and it is now apparent to many, that her imperfections were magnified into vices, by slander and malice; and that her excellencies were absurdly extolled, by friends whose attachment was too ardent, and whose opinion was therefore not sufficiently impartial.

CHAPTER III.

Concluding Observations.

THE page of biography has thus closed; and as the historian retires, it is the business of the moralist to advance. These volumes of individual history will be perused with pain and regret, by every one whose mind is rightly constituted, and whose heart is not incapable of noble and generous sympathy. They develop actual positive misery, and one continued narrative of sorrow and suffering. Whatever might have been the cause of such evils, their existence cannot be disputed, and that reality must therefore excite pity and regret. But what were the causes of such occurrences? The preceding pages have practically answered the question, and they are as much to be deplored as the effects.

That the Heir-Apparent to the Throne of a free country, should be compelled, against his inclinations, to unite his destiny with an individual whom he did not love, is a circumstance which the statesman, the moralist, and the philanthropist must deplore. And that the daughter of the brave, and virtuous, and noble Duke of Brunswick, should also be induced to consent to an union, to which she was averse, is equally lamentable.

Against such arrangements of national policy many objections to their theory might be urged; but the history of this marriage is so replete with proofs of their baneful operation, that theory is superseded by fact, and supposition by demonstration. To all nations, and to all governments it must read a lesson which should never be forgotten, and which should not only be deplored, but should induce an universal determination to repeal or discontinue all laws or customs, however sanctioned by experience, or venerable for antiquity, which are the real causes of evils so dire, and which unhappily are as frequent as they are distressing.

But the marriage took place. What should have been the conduct of each of the distinguished personages under such circumstances? As a woman and a wife, the Princess should have been courteous, kind, respectful, attentive, and submissive. She should not have expected that ardour of affection, and that care and assiduous attention which she would have had a right to expect, if the Prince had professed to love her, and if she had loved the Prince. Her rank, her character, her accomplishments, her family, her relationship to the reigning Monrach, and to the Heir-Apparent; ought, however, to have obtained for her, the public and private respect, confidence, and society of the Prince. These she did not obtain. Others, far less deserving, studied to supplant her, and they succeeded. Under such circumstances,

she should have been retired in her habits—avoided subjects which excited painful feelings or recollections, and submitted to what was unavoidable. Here, however, she must necessarily stop, and her conduct respecting Lady Jersey, was dignified, judicious, and commendable. If she had not so acted, she would not have deserved the respect which she claimed; and because her demands were proper, George III. insisted on the dismissal of that Lady from the establishment of the Prince, and she was accordingly removed.

As to the Prince, his situation was even more peculiar. He consummated a marriage without sufficiently reflecting on its consequences. He forgot that Lady Jersey, and Mrs. Fitzherbert must be wholly relinquished, and so relinquished for a Princess, whom he did not love, though he had made her his bride. But he speedily discovered his error, and that was the moment of difficulty. His determinations have been related, and the consequences which followed, have been also unfolded. Of the conduct of the Princess he did not, however, complain. The path in which it was proper for her to proceed she generally persevered in, but her occasional variations, perhaps, increased the evils which embittered her future life, and rendered her case the most unparalleled for misfortune and unhappiness, that is recorded in the pages of ancient or modern history. Those variations must, however, be partly attributed to her natural disposition, which was eminently opposed

to concealment or secresy. Her dislikes she never attempted to hide, and her friendships were as ardent as they were durable.

But they were separated. That act was originally that of the Prince. His celebrated letter tacitly admitted it. Yet it was afterwards approved by the Princess, and was *then* wise and necessary. Thus living apart, they should each have avoided acts which each were *confident* were disapproved by the other; to say nothing of those which might be fairly left to their mutual discretion. The inventions of Lady Douglas should not, therefore, have been so readily accredited; and when subsequently demonstrated to be as false as they were malicious, the Princess should have received from her illustrious husband, a public as well as a private recognition of her innocence. But the reverse of this acknowledgment was the conduct pursued; and when the reigning Monarch was about to receive her Royal Highness into his presence and favour, he was requested to delay such proofs of his satisfaction of her innocence. Thus were the measures of Lady Douglas unreprobated by the Prince, when she should have become the object of his most cordial detestation. That, however, the Prince was in no way concerned in the invention of her plot, or in its development, cannot be too clearly stated; and at first he was unquestionably imposed on by the positivity of her allegations. They demanded enquiry; but when proved to be false, they should have been so considered. By the nation they

were regarded with abhorrence, and "Lady "Douglas" and "Perjury" are terms universally identified. She afforded a sad and mournful example of the effects of jealousy, malice, and revenge, when wholly unsubdued by moral or religious feelings.

The reinvestigation of her allegations was an act of injustice, and a work of supererogation. The report of the Commissioners had been so distinct, that it was so unnecessary for the Prince, the Royal Family, and the nation; and the result of such reinvestigation demonstrates the correctness of this observation. Again and again were the statements of Lady Douglas proved to be perjuries, and admitted so to be, by one of the Ministers of the Crown in the senate of the nation.

Her subsequent rejection at Court, and her deprivation of the RIGHTS OF A MOTHER, were unkind and vexatious proceedings; and now was demonstrated the truth of statements which had been often made, and as often denied, that the various enquiries relative to the Princess, were sanctioned by some members of the Royal Family, and even by the Prince himself.

But what was the line of conduct adopted by the Princess? It could not be expected that she should spend her future years in solitude; but there is a distinction between solitude and retirement. Her sufferings, as they were exclusively of a private nature, she ought to have concealed; and whilst she could not but lament her situation, she should have felt, that it should not excite

surprize, though it could not fail of producing unhappiness.

The conduct of the late Queen to her was, doubtless, unkind and oppressive; but she should have felt, that she was a subject of the reigning King, and that her enemy was his Consort. That the Prince should have differently acted to his wife and his cousin cannot be disputed; but she should have recollected, that there is *always* a wide separation between the Prince and the people, and that it would be neither honourable nor praiseworthy to attempt its extension. She should not, therefore, have publicly exposed her situation, nor appealed to *national* feeling on a subject exclusively at that time *personal*; nor, on the same principle, should she, in a less public manner, have discussed in her literary and friendly circles, the conduct of one whom all knew that she did not love, and whose happiness she could not then be expected to promote. Approbation of his character she was not required to bestow; but censure it was unnecessary and improper publicly to pronounce.

But the circumstances of the case were communicated to the people, and her total rejection at Court and the alienation of her daughter from her were the consequences which ensued. The latter act unquestionably was as harsh as it was unprecedented. The rights of a mother are natural, and no laws or prerogatives should deprive her of their enjoyments. The rights of parents are, in this respect, equal, and neither should have the power

or the inclination exclusively to exercise them. To her mother the Princess Charlotte was much attached. She desired her society and advice, especially as she had received an offer of marriage, which she hesitated either to accept or refuse. But such society and advice were prohibited, and the Princess of Wales in vain appealed for justice and her rights. What then was to be done? She was advised to publish her letter to the Prince in the public prints. Such advice was *imprudent* and *absurd*. If by such act, it was intended solely to create national antipathy to the Prince, the proceeding was *imprudent*, because, from such result, no possible good could accrue; and, as a subject, she was bound to act with submission; and if it was intended to alarm the Prince, and thereby obtain the ends desired, then the measure was *absurd*. Yet it must be admitted, that her situation was painful and vexatious; and it can be easily conceived, that any disinterested and well-intentioned advice might be then adopted by her without due consideration. Tossed on the billows of adversity, chagrin, and disappointment, she only contemplated her misfortunes; and every straw which floated on the surge, and which promised relief or salvation, was eagerly seized, though their eventual insufficiency only increased her misfortunes.

Her non-introduction to the foreign Emperors who visited this country, was a petty act, unworthy of any wise or good men. Her father had braved the storm which threatened to involve the

liberties of Europe; and her brother, like his illustrious sire, had died in defence of the liberties of Germany. She, therefore, should not have been forgotten, and some proceeding should have been adopted to recognize her existence in this country, and her connection with the Prince Regent, though it could not be expected that she should become the centre of all that was brilliant and splendid.

Thus disappointed, and mortified, she determined to quit this country, especially as by such act she would, in her estimation, improve the condition of her daughter. But that determination was improper. Some of her friends advised the measure; but they were few in number, and their arguments were as futile as they eventually proved to be incorrect. Yet it must be conceded, that she so resolved from motives the most pure, and which reflected honour on her heart, although her judgment cannot be applauded.

Having, however, come to this resolution, she should have conducted herself with peculiar circumspection, and endeavoured to avoid even the appearance of evil. That she indulged in vices of the most immoral description has been *incorrectly* stated; yet, it must be admitted, that if she had duly and properly estimated the probable effects which many acts she performed were likely to produce, she would have abstained from their commission; and thus, to a certain extent, prevented evils which embittered her future life, and speedily consigned her to the tomb.

Still it should be admitted, that many of such actions were in themselves unexceptionable, though they were unfortunate in their results. Thus it appears only just to admit, that the honours which she conferred on Bergami, by no means demonstrated that she was guilty of the charge subsequently brought against her; and yet, that speedy elevation was injudicious, not to say improper.

As, however, on the other hand, she had quitted this country—had left the Prince to enjoy unmolested by her presence, the adulation of his friends, and the luxuries of English hospitality and English comfort—and as the moral and political conduct of the Prince, whether of a more public or private nature, were now by her wholly uninquired about, it was improper, unjust, and cruel of any Administration, to advise enquiries to be instituted into all the minutiæ of her Continental arrangements; and it was base and wicked to invent charges, or to employ agents, who were capable of thus sacrificing every honest and virtuous principle. That there was no real *state necessity* for such enquiries, has been admitted. The succession was not in danger. The brothers of the King were numerous, and some of them much respected. The Princess of Wales was on the Continent.—From her the Prince was practically divorced, and although if she had committed crimes, she ought to be punished for them, yet as the favourite ladies of the Prince were in England, well known, and even their names un-

concealed, it was not delicate or proper that punctilios should be too nicely regarded by the one party, when if the same rigid principles had been applied to the case of the other, the result might have been far less satisfactory.

But was the Queen guilty of adultery? The charge has not certainly been proved, nor is it accredited. Some witnesses indeed endeavoured to support such an allegation, but notwithstanding their characters, and notwithstanding the sums of money they received, as inducements to give evidence unfavourable to the Queen, no distinct charge could be clearly proved, but the statements of one hour, were contradicted in the next.

Yet it cannot be properly contended, that if the Queen had been really guilty of the charges brought against her, she should not have been tried and condemned, for no circumstances can constitute any apology for the commission of vices so flagrant and detestable,—so long perpetrated, and so frequently repeated, as those which she was stated to have perpetrated. If she was guilty, then for the honour of the country,—for the benefit of mankind,—for the dignity of the crown, it was right that she should be not only exposed, but punished.—But not condemned unheard,—not denied the prayers of the people before one charge was substantiated,—not held up as an object of universal detestation before one allegation was proved. It was right that if guilty, she should be punished, but not be tried by her accusers—by her decided enemies—by those who had planned her destruc-

tion, and who now sought, by her condemnation, to vindicate their past conduct. No, all this was unjust, and therefore improper, and succeeding generations when calmly deliberating on the transactions of the last few years of this eventful æra, will accurately perceive the source of many of the calumnies which have existed, and will trace them to the baneful and improper efforts of an unprincipled and unjust Administration.

Her return to this country was a measure, which, if innocent of the crime laid to her charge, was dignified and noble; but if guilty, it was an act of daring impudence and outrageous indecorum. Guilty she was not proved to be, and therefore innocent she must be presumed to have been. Her return was therefore to be presumed as an act of propriety, and an avowal of innocence. The mere fact of her return neither *proved* innocence or guilt, though it afforded a presumption of innocence, because guilt is seldom so hazardous and daring. It has been argued, that even if guilty, the conduct of the Queen should not have been investigated by the King or by the nation;—that she was virtually repudiated;—that her example could not have been pernicious to the morals of a country, from which she was far removed;—and that, there was no reason why the moral acts of the Prince should not have with far greater propriety become the subjects of judicial enquiry. The accuracy or inaccuracy of such reasoning, need not, however, be investigated. She was not only not proved to be guilty,

but by deduction as well as by proof, *she was demonstrated to be innocent.*

As to the charges of general levity and flippancy of conduct, distinct from the main allegation of adultery, it must be conceded even by her friends, that she possessed in too great a degree, the familiarity of the French, and the peculiarity of the Italian character. Her conduct was frequently inexplicable, though perfectly virtuous. "Prudence" was a word with which she was not sufficiently familiar, and her virtues were public and splendid, not retired and unassuming. Her friendships were, if possible, too ardent, and her antipathies too inveterate. But she was generous, noble minded, honourable, just, and forgiving. She was all kindness and sensibility; but, she was so unaccustomed to sincerity and constancy, that when she discovered them in an individual, she valued them, if possible, too highly. Alas! she was too much the child of circumstances; and, it is a lamentable fact, that she was the child of sorrow. If she was imprudent in any of her domestic arrangements, it should not be forgotten, that, at the age of twenty-eight, she was practically a widow! Nor did the Queen Consort of George III. endeavour to relieve the misery of her situation by her advice or direction. Almost unaided, she had originally to form her establishment, her society, her habits; and, she was, after all, a foreigner to English manners, and English prejudices.

On her return to England, she was improperly

treated. No palace was assigned to her—honour paid her;—but, as if convicted of crime, she was denied the honours of royalty, and even the respect and attention to which she was entitled as a woman. When practically acquitted, she was denied the ceremony of Coronation—the introduction of her name into the Liturgy—and the palaces of her predecessors. Her requests were all refused; and, though Queen Consort, she was unadmitted into the Royal presence—unacknowledged at Court—and unnoticed by those who, if her daughter had survived, would have courted her favour, and basked in the sunshine of her prosperity.

But yet the Queen acted with indiscretion. She acknowledged that she was a subject, and yet she reprobated in some of her answers to the addresses of her fellow subjects, the conduct of her King too pointedly and severely—she spoke too much to the people—she appeared too much to seek to widen the distance between herself and the King—the acts of conciliation of one day were succeeded by threats on the next—she attacked the House of Peers, the House of Commons, the Privy Council, and the King. If she had not so acted, she would have been even more supported by the higher classes of society, because to them she would then have appeared to connect herself less with any supposed faction, to which on political grounds they were opposed.

But Death approached to prevent further conflict and opposition. She welcomed his arrival, and smiled at its certainty. *She died the victim of grief. Her grief was occasioned by disappointed pride, and the repeated insults to which she was subjected by her cruel and relentless enemies.* This fact must be recorded;—and to Monarchs it may read a lesson, which, amidst all the splendour of their equipages; and the variety of their pleasures; and the flattery of their courties; and all which glares and lures by its specious and meretricious appearance, must sometimes be made to reach their ears, if not to affect their hearts—that all their dignity and grandeur, all which now attracts the notice of the heedless, and the acclamations of the ignorant, they may speedily be required to relinquish—aye, and to resign at the very moment, when in security they seemed to repose, and when having overcome the difficulties which were opposed to them, they looked forward to many days of satisfaction and delight.

FINIS.

Printed by J. Haddon, Tabernacle-Walk.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

(No. I.)

Letter from Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales to His Majesty King George the Third, containing her Defence to the Charges preferred against her by Lady Douglas and others, in 1806.

SIRE,

IMPRESSED with the deepest sentiments of gratitude for the countenance and protection which I have hitherto uniformly received from your Majesty, I approach you with a heart undismayed, upon the occasion, so awful and momentous to my character, my honour, and my happiness. I should indeed (under charges such as have been now brought against me) prove myself undeserving of the continuance of that countenance and protection, and altogether unworthy of the high station which I hold in your Majesty's family, if I sought for any impartiality, for any indulgence, for any thing more than what is due to me in justice. My entire confidence in your Majesty's virtues assures me that I cannot meet with less.

The situation which I have been so happy as to hold in your Majesty's good opinion and esteem, my station in your Majesty's august family, my life, my honour, and through mine, the honour of your Majesty's family, have been attacked. Sir John and Lady Douglas have attempted to support and direct a precise charge, by which they have dared to impute to me the enormous guilt of High Treason, committed in the foul act of Adultery. In this charge the extravagance of their malice has defeated itself. The Report of the Lords Commissioners acting under your Majesty's Warrant, has most fully cleared me of that charge.

But there remain imputations, strangely sanctioned and countenanced by that Report, on which I cannot remain silent without incurring the most fatal consequence to my honour and character. For it states to your Majesty, that 'circumstances

detailed against me must be credited till they are decisively contradicted.' To contradict with as much decision as the contradiction of an accused can convey; to expose the injustice and malice of my enemies; to shew the utter impossibility of giving credit to their testimony; and to vindicate my own innocence, will be the objects, Sire, of this Letter.

In the course of my pursuing these objects, I shall have much to complain of, in the substance of the proceeding itself, and much in the manner of conducting it.

That any of the charges should ever have been entertained upon testimony so little worthy of belief, which betrayed in every sentence the malice in which it originated; that even if they were entertained at all, your Majesty should have been advised to pass by the ordinary legal modes of inquiry into such high crimes, and to refer them to a Commission, open to all the objections which I shall have to state to such a mode of inquiry; that the Commissioners, after having negatived the principal charge of substantive crime, should have entertained considerations of matter that amounted to no legal offence, and which were adduced, not as substantive charges in themselves, but as matters in support of the principal accusation; that through the pressure and weight of their official occupations, they did not,—perhaps they could not,—bestow that attention on the case, which, if given to it, must have enabled them to detect the villainy and falsehood of my accusers, and their foul conspiracy against me, and must have preserved my character against the weighty imputation which the authority of the Commissioners has for a time cast upon it; and above all, that they should upon this *ex parte* examination, without hearing one word that I could urge, have reported to your Majesty an opinion on these matters, so prejudicial to my honour, and from which I can have no appeal to the laws of the country (because the charges, constituting no legal offence, cannot be made the ground of judicial inquiry;) these, and other circumstances connected, with the length of the proceedings, which have cruelly aggravated to my feeling, the pain necessarily attendant upon this inquiry, I shall not be able to refrain from stating and urging as matters of serious lamentation at least,— if not of well-grounded complaint.

" In commenting upon any part of the circumstances which have occurred in the course of this inquiry, whatever observations I may be compelled to make upon any of them, I trust I shall never forget what is due to officers in high station and employment under your Majesty. No apology, therefore, can be required for any reserve in my expressions towards them. But, if, in vindicating my innocence against the injustice and malice of my enemies, I should appear to your Majesty not to express myself with all the warmth and indignation which innocence so foully calumniated must feel, your Majesty will, I trust, not attribute my forbearance to any insensibility to the grievous injuries I have sustained, but will graciously be pleased to ascribe it to the restraint I have imposed upon myself, lest, in endeavouring to describe in just terms the motives, the conduct, the perjury, and all the foul circumstances which characterise and establish the malice of my accusers, I might use language, which, though not unjustly applied to them, might be improper to be used by me to any body, or unfit to be employed by any body, humbly, respectfully, and dutifully addressing your Majesty. That a fit opportunity has occurred for laying open my heart to your Majesty, perhaps I shall hereafter have no reason to lament.

For more than two years, I have been informed, that upon the presumption of some misconduct in me, my behaviour had been the subject of investigation, *and my neighbours' servants had been examined concerning it:* and for some time I had received mysterious and indistinct intimations, that some great mischief was meditated towards me; and in all the circumstances of my peculiar situation, it would be thought strange, that, however conscious that I had no just cause for fear, I should yet feel some uneasiness on this account. With surprise certainly, (because the first tidings were of a kind to excite surprise,) but without alarm, I received the intelligence, that, for some reason, a formal investigation of some parts of my conduct had been advised, and had taken place.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, on the 7th of June, 1806, announced it to me. He announced to me, the Princess of Wales, the near approach of two attornies (one of them, I since find, the Solicitor employed by Sir John Douglas,) claiming

to enter my dwelling with a Warrant to take away one half of my Household, for immediate examination upon a charge against myself. It now appears it was the charge of High Treason, committed in the infamous crime of Adultery. His Royal Highness will, I am sure, do me the justice to represent to your Majesty, that I betrayed no fear—that I manifested no guilt—that I sought no excuses to prepare or tutor my servants, for the examination which they were to undergo. The only request which I made to his Royal Highness was, that he would have the goodness to remain with me till the servants were gone, that he might bear witness that I had no conversation with them before they went. In truth, Sire, my anxieties under a knowledge that some serious mischief was planning against me, and while I was ignorant of its quality and extent, had been so great, that I could not but rejoice at an event which seemed to promise me an early opportunity of ascertaining what the malice of my enemies intended against me. It has not been, indeed, without impatience, the most painful, that I have passed the interval which has since elapsed. When it was not only known to the world (for it was known to the world) that enquiry of the gravest nature had been instituted into my conduct, I looked to the conclusion with all the eagerness that could belong to an absolute conviction that my innocence and my honour, to the disgrace and confusion of my accusers, would be established, and that the groundless malice and injustice of the whole charge would be manifested to the world, as widely as the calumny had been circulated. I knew that the result of an *ex parte* inquiry from its very nature, could not, unless it fully asserted my innocence, be in any degree just; and I had taught myself more firmly to believe, that it was utterly impossible that any opinion which could in the smallest degree work a prejudice to my honour and to my character, could even be expressed in any terms, by any persons in a Report upon a solemn formal inquiry, and more especially to your Majesty, without my having some notice and some opportunity of being heard; and I was convinced, that, if the proceeding allowed me, before an opinion was expressed, the ordinary means which accused persons have of vindicating their honour and their innocence, my honour and my innocence must, in any opinion which could

then be expressed, be fully vindicated and effectually established. What then, Sire, must have been my astonishment and my dismay, when I saw that notwithstanding the principal accusation was found to be utterly false, yet some of the witnesses to those charges which were brought in support of the principal accusation,—witnesses whom any person, interested to have protected my character, would easily have shewn, out of their own mouths, to be utterly unworthy of credit, and confederates in joint conspiracy with my false accusers, are reported to be 'free from all suspicion of unfavourable bias;' their veracity, in the judgment of the Commissioners 'not to be questioned;' and their infamous stories and insinuations against me to be such as deserve 'the most serious consideration, and as such to be credited till decisively contradicted.'

The inquiry, after I thus had notice of it, continued for above two months. I ventured not to complain, as if it had been unnecessarily protracted. The important duties and official avocations of the Noble Lords appointed to carry it on, may naturally account for and excuse some delay. But, however excusable it may have been, your Majesty will conceive the pain and anxiety which this interval of suspence has occasioned; and your Majesty will not be surprised if I further represent, that I have found a great aggravation of my painful sufferings in the delay which occurred in communicating the Report to me; for though it is dated on the 14th of July, I did not receive it till the 11th of August, notwithstanding your Majesty's gracious commands. It was due unquestionably to your Majesty, that the result of an inquiry commanded by your Majesty, upon advice which had been offered, touching matters of the highest import, should be first, and immediately, communicated to you. The respect and honour due to the Prince of Wales, the interest he must necessarily have taken in this inquiry, combined to make it indispensably fit that the result should be forthwith also stated to his Royal Highness. I complain not therefore that it was too early communicated to any one; I complain only, and I complain most seriously, (for I felt it most seriously), of the delay in its communication to me.

Rumour had informed the world, that the Report had been early communicated to your Majesty and to his Royal Highness.

I did not receive the benefit intended for me, by your Majesty's most gracious command, till a month after the Report was signed. But the same rumour had represented me, to my infinite prejudice, as in possession of the Report during that month; and the malice of those who wished to stain my honour, has not failed to suggest all that malice could infer from its remaining in that possession so long. May I be permitted to say, that, if the Report acquits me, my innocence entitles me to receive from those to whom your Majesty's commands had been given, an immediate notification of the fact that it did acquit me;—that, if it did condemn me, the afflicting weight of such a sentence should not have been left to settle in any mind, much less upon your Majesty's, for a month before I could even begin to prepare for an answer, which, when begun, could not speedily be concluded; and that if the Report could be represented as both acquitting and condemning me, the reasons, which suggested the propriety of an early communication in each of the former cases, combined to make it proper and necessary in the latter.

And why all consideration of my feelings was thus cruelly neglected—why I was kept upon the rack, during all this time, ignorant of the result of a charge which affected my honour and my life—and why, especially in a case where such grave matters were to continue to be credited to the prejudice of my honour, till they were 'decidedly contradicted,' the means of knowing what it was that I must endeavour to contradict, were withholden from me a single unnecessary hour, I know not, and I will not trust myself in the attempt to conjecture.

On the 11th of August, however, I at length received from the Lord Chancellor a packet, containing copies of the Warrant or Commission, authorising the Inquiry; of the Report, and of the Examinations on which the Report was founded; and your Majesty may be graciously pleased to recollect, that on the 13th I returned my grateful thanks to your Majesty for having ordered these papers to be sent to me. Your Majesty will readily imagine, that, upon a subject of such importance, I could not venture to trust only to my own advice; and those with whom I advised, suggested, that the Declaration or Charge, upon which the Inquiry had proceeded, and which the Com-

missioners refer to in their Report, and represent to be the essential foundation of the whole proceedings, did not accompany the Examination and the Report, and also that the Papers themselves were not authenticated.

I ventured, therefore, to address your Majesty upon the supposed defects in the communication, and humbly requested that the Copies of the Papers which I then returned, might, after being examined and authenticated, be again transmitted to me, and that I might also be furnished with the Copies of the written Declarations, so referred to in the Report, and my humble thanks are due for your Majesty's compliance with my request.—On the 29th of August I received, in consequence, the attested Copies of those Declarations, and a Narrative of his Royal Highness the Duke of Kent; and a few days afterwards, on the 3rd of September, the attested Copies of the Examinations which were taken before the Commissioners.

The Papers which I have received are as follow:

Narrative of his R. H. the Duke of Kent, dated 27, Dec. 1805.

Copy of the written Declarations, of Sir John and Lady Douglas, dated Dec. 3, 1805.

A Paper containing the written Declarations, or Examinations, of the persons hereafter enumerated:—The title to these Papers is, "For the Purpose of confirming the Statement made by Lady Douglas, of the circumstances mentioned in her Narrative. The following Examinations have been taken, and which have been signed by the several persons who have been examined."

Two of Sarah Lampert; one, dated Cheltenham, Jan. 8, 1806; and the other, March 29, 1806.

One of Wm. Lampert, baker, 114, Cheltenham, apparently same date as the last of Sarah Lampert's.

Four of W. Cole, dated respectively, Jan. 11, 14, 30, and Feb. 23, 1806.

One of Robert Bidgood, dated Temple, April 4, 1806.

One of Sarah Bidgood, dated Temple, April 23, 1806.

One of Frances Lloyd, dated Temple, May 12, 1806.

The other Papers and Documents which accompany the Report are,

1806	May 1	No. 1.	The King's Warrant or Commission.
	June 1	2.	Deposition of Lady Douglas.
	—— 1	3.	of Sir John Douglas.
	—— 6	4.	of Robert Bidgood.
	—— 6	5.	of William Cole.
	—— 7	6.	of Frances Lloyd.
	—— 7	7.	of Mary Wilson.
	—— 7.	8.	of Samuel Roberts.

1806, June 7	9.	Deposition of Thomas Stikeman.
—— 7	10.	of J. Sicard.
—— 7	11.	of Charlotte Sander.
—— 7	12.	of Sophia Austin.
—— 20	13.	Letter from Lord Spencer to Lord Gwydir.
—— 21	14.	from Lord Gwydir to Lord Spencer.
—— 21	15.	from Lady Willoughby to Lord Spencer.
—— 23	16.	Extract from Register of Brownlow-st. hospital.
—— 23	17.	Deposition of Elizabeth Gosden.
—— 23	18.	of Betty Townley.
—— 25	19.	of Thomas Edmeades.
—— 25	20.	of Samuel G. Mills.
—— 26	21.	of Harriet Fitzgerald.
—— 27	22.	Letter from Lord Spencer to Lord Gwydir.
July 3	23.	from Lord Gwydir to Lord Spencer.
—— 3	24.	Queries of Lady Willoughby and Answers.
—— 3	25.	Further Deposition of R. Bidgood.
—— 3	26.	Deposition of Sir Francis Milman.
—— 3	27.	of Mrs. Lisle.
—— 4	28.	Letter from Sir F. Milman to the Lord Chancellor.
—— 16	29.	Deposition of Lord Cholmondeley.
—— 14	30.	The Report.

By the Copy which I have received of the Commission, or Warrant, under which the Inquiry has been prosecuted, it appears to be an Instrument under your Majesty's Sign Manual, not counter-signed, not under any Seal. It recites, that an Abstract of certain written Declarations, touching my conduct, without specifying by whom those Declarations were made, or the nature of the matters touching which they had been made, or even by whom the Abstract had been prepared, had been laid before your Majesty; into the truth of which it purports to authorize the four noble Peers, who are named in it, to enquire and to examine upon oath, such persons as they think fit, and to report to your Majesty the result of their Examination.

By referring to the written Declaration, it appears that they contain allegations against me, amounting to the charge of high treason, and also other matters which, if understood to be, as they seem to have been acted and reported upon by the Commissioners, not as evidence confirmatory (as they are expressed to be in the title) of the principal charge, but as distinct and substantive subjects of examination, cannot, as I am advised, be represented as in law amounting to crimes.—How most of the Declara-

tions referred to were collected, by whom, at whose solicitation, under what sanction, and before what persons, magistrates, or others, they were made, does not appear. By the title, indeed, which all the within Declarations, except Sir John and Lady Douglas's, bear, viz. '*That they had been taken for the purpose of confirming Lady Douglas's statement*,' it may be collected, they had been made by her, or at least by Sir John's procurement, and the concluding passage of one of them, I mean the 4th declaration of William Cole, strengthens this opinion, as it represents Sir John Douglas, accompanied by his solicitor, Mr. Lowten, to have gone down as far as Cheltenham, for the examination of two witnesses, whose declarations are there stated. I am, however, at no loss to know at this moment, whom I am to consider, or whom I could fix upon, as my false accuser. From the circumstance last mentioned, it might be inferred, that Sir John Douglas, or one of them, is the accuser. But Lady Douglas, in her written declaration, so far from representing the information which she then gives, as moving voluntarily from herself, expressly states, that she gives it under the direct command of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and the Papers leave me without any information from whom any communication to the Prince originated, which induced him to give such commands.

" Upon the question how far the advice is agreeable to law, under which it was recommended to your Majesty, to issue this warrant or commission, not counter-signed, or under a seal, and without any of your Majesty's advisers, therefore, being on the face of it responsible for its issuing, I am not competent to determine. And, undoubtedly, that the two high legal authorities, the Lord Chancellor, and the Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench, consented to act under it, it is with the greatest doubt and diffidence that I can bring myself to express my suspicion of its illegality. But if it be, as I am given to understand it is, open to question, whether consistently with law, your Majesty should have been advised, to command, by this warrant or commission, persons, not to act in known character, as Secretaries of State, as Privy Counsellors, as Magistrates otherwise empowered; but to act, as Commissioners, and under the sole authority of such warrant, to enquire (without any authority to hear and determine any thing upon the subject of those Inquiries)

into the crime of High Treason, under the sanction of oaths, to be administered by them as such Commissioners, and to report the result thereof to your Majesty. If, I say, there can be any question upon the legality of such a Warrant or Commission, the extreme hardship, with which it has operated upon me, the extreme prejudice which it has done to my character, and to which such a proceeding must ever expose the person who is the object of it, obliges me, till I am convinced of its legality, to forbear from acknowledging its authority; and, with all humility and deference to your Majesty, to protest against it, and against all the proceedings under it.

If this, indeed, were matter of mere form, I should be ashamed to urge it. But the actual hardships and prejudice, which I have suffered by this proceeding are most obvious. For, upon the principal charge against me, the Commissioners have most satisfactorily, and "without the least hesitation," for such is their expression, reported their opinion of its falsehood. Sir John and Lady Douglas, therefore, who have sworn to its truth, have been guilty of the plainest falsehood; yet upon the supposition of the illegality of this Commission, their falsehood must, as I am informed, go unpunished. Upon that supposition, the want of legal authority in the Commissioners to inquire and to administer an oath, will render it impossible to give to this falsehood the character of perjury. But this is by no means the circumstance which I feel the most severely. Beyond the vindicating of my own character, and the consideration of providing for my future security, I can assure your Majesty, that the punishment of Sir John and Lady Douglas would afford me no satisfaction. It is not, therefore, with regard to that part of the charge, which is negatived, but with respect to those, which are sanctioned by the Report, those, which, not aiming at my life, exhaust themselves upon my character, and which the Commissioners have, in some measure, sanctioned by their Report, that I have the greatest reason to complain. Had the Report sanctioned the principal charge, constituting a known legal crime, my innocence would have emboldened me, at all risques, (and to more, no person has ever been exposed from the malice and falsehood of accusers,) to have demanded that trial, which could legally determine upon the truth or falsehood of such charge. Though I should even

then indeed have had some cause to complain, because I should have gone to that trial, under the prejudice, necessarily raised against me, by that Report; yet in a proceeding before the just, open, and known tribunals of your Majesty's kingdom, I should have had a safe appeal from the result of an *ex parte* investigation; an investigation which has exposed me to all the hardships of a *secret* inquiry, without giving me the benefit of *secrecy;* and to all the severe consequences of a public investigation, in point of injury to my character, without affording me any of its substantial benefits in point of security. But the charges which the Commissioners do sanction by their Report, describing them, with a mysterious obscurity and indefinite generality, constitute, as I am told, no legal crime. They are described as "instances of great impropriety and indecency of behaviour," which must "occasion the most unfavourable interpretations;" and they are reported to your Majesty, and they are stated to be, "circumstances which must be credited till they are decisively contradicted."

From this opinion, this judgment of the Commissioners, bearing so hard upon my character (and that a female character, how delicate, and how easily to be affected by the breath of calumny your Majesty well knows,) I can have no appeal. For, as the charges constitute no legal crimes, they cannot be the subjects of any legal trial. I can call for no trial. I can therefore have no appeal; I can look for no acquittal. Yet this opinion, or this judgment, from which I can have no appeal, has been pronounced against me upon mere *ex parte* investigation.

This hardship, Sire, I am told to ascribe to the nature of the proceeding under this warrant or commission; for, had the inquiry been entered into before your Majesty's Privy Council, or before any magistrates, authorised by law as such, to inquire into the existence of treason, the known course of proceeding before that council, or such magistrates, the known extent of their jurisdiction over crimes, and not over the proprieties of behaviour, would have preserved me from the possibility of having matters made the subjects of inquiry which had in law no substantive criminal character, and from the extreme hardship of having my reputation injured by calumny altogether unfounded, but rendered at once more safe to my enemies, and more in-

jurious to me, by being uttered, in the course of a proceeding, assuming the grave semblance of legal form. And, it is by the nature of this proceeding, (which could alone have countenanced or admitted of this licentious latitude of inquiry, into the proprieties of behaviour in private life, with which no court, no magistrate, no public law has any authority to interfere,) that I have been deprived of the benefit of that entire and unqualified acquittal and discharge from this accusation, to which the utter and proved falsehood of the accusation itself so justly entitled me.

I trust, therefore, that your Majesty will see that if this proceeding is not one to which, by the known laws of your Majesty's kingdom, I ought to be subject, that it is no cold, formal objection, which leads me to protest against it.

I am ready to acknowledge, Sire, from the consequences which might arise to the public, from such misconduct as have been falsely imputed to me, that my honour and virtue are of more importance to the State than those of other women. That my conduct therefore may be fitly subjected, when necessary, to a severer scrutiny. But, it cannot follow, because my character is of more importance, that it may therefore be attacked with more impunity. And as I know, that this mischief has been pending over my head for more than two years, that private examinations of my neighbours' servants, and of my own, have, at times, during that interval, been taken, for the purpose of establishing charges against me, not indeed by the instrumentality of Sir John and Lady Douglas alone, but by the sanction, and in the presence of the Earl of Moira (as your Majesty will perceive by the deposition of Jonathan Partridge, which I subjoin;—and, as I know also, and make appear to your Majesty likewise, by the same means, that declarations of persons of unquestionable credit, respecting my conduct, attesting my innocence, and directly falsifying a most important circumstance respecting my supposed pregnancy, mentioned in the declarations, on which the inquiry was instituted; as I know, I say, that those declarations, so favourable to me, appear to my infinite prejudice, not to have been communicated to your Majesty, when that inquiry was commanded; and, as I know not how soon, nor how often, proceedings against me may be meditated by my enemies,

I take leave to express my humble trust, that, before any other proceedings may be had against me, (desirable as it may have been thought, that the inquiry should have been of the nature which has, in this instance, been obtained,) your Majesty would be graciously pleased to require to be advised, whether my guilt, if I were guilty, could not be as effectually discovered and punished, and my honour and innocence, if innocent, be more effectually secured and established by other more known and regular modes of proceeding.

Having, therefore, Sire, upon these grave reasons, ventured to submit, I trust without offence, these considerations upon the nature of the commission and the proceedings under it, I will now proceed to observe upon the Report, and the Examinations; and, with your Majesty's permission, I will go through the whole matter, in that course which has been observed by the Report itself, and which an examination of the important matters that it contains, in the order in which it states them, will naturally suggest.

The Report, after referring to the Commission or Warrant under which their Lordships were acting, after stating that they had proceeded to examine the several witnesses, whose depositions they annexed to their Report, proceeds to state the effect of the written declarations, which the Commissioners considered as the essential foundation of the whole proceeding. "That they were statements which had been laid before his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, respecting the conduct of her Royal Highness the Princess; that these statements not only imputed to her Royal Highness great impropriety and indecency of behaviour, but expressly asserted, partly on the ground of certain alleged declarations from the Princess's own mouth, and partly on the personal observation of the informants, the following most important facts; viz. that her Royal Highness had been pregnant in the year 1802, in consequence of an illicit intercourse, and that she had in the same year, been secretly delivered of a male child; which child had ever since that period been brought up by her Royal Highness in her own house, and under her immediate inspection. These allegations thus made, had, as the Commissioners found, been followed by declarations from other persons, who had not indeed spoken to the important facts of the

pregnancy or delivery of her Royal Highness, but had related other particulars, in themselves extremely suspicious, and still more so, when connected with the assertions already mentioned. The Report then states, that, in the painful situation in which his Royal Highness was placed by these declarations, they learnt that he had adopted the only course which could, in their judgment, with propriety be followed, when informations such as these had been thus confidently alleged and particularly detailed, and had in some degree been supported by collateral evidence, applying to other points of the same nature (though going to a far less extent,) one line could only be pursued."

" Every sentiment of duty to your Majesty, and of concern for the public welfare, required that these particulars should not be withheld from your Majesty, to whom more particularly belonged the cognizance of a matter of state, so nearly touching the honour of your Majesty's Royal Family, and by possibility affecting the succession of your Majesty's crown."

The Commissioners, therefore, your Majesty observes, going, they must permit me to say, a little out of their way, begin their Report, by expressing a clear and decided opinion, that his Royal Highness was properly advised (for your Majesty will undoubtedly conclude, that, upon a subject of this importance, his Royal Highness could not but have acted but by advice of others, in referring this complaint to your Majesty, for the purpose of its undergoing the investigation which has followed, and unquestionably, if the charge, referred to in this Report, as made by Sir John and Lady Douglas had been presented under circumstances, in which any reasonable degree of credit could be given to them, or even if they had not been presented in such a manner, as to impeach the credit of the informers, and to bear internal evidence of their incredibility, I should be the last person, who would be disposed to dispute the wisdom of the advice which led to make them the subject of the gravest and most anxious inquiry. And your Majesty, acting upon a mere abstract of the declarations, which was all, that, by the recital of the warrant, appears to have been laid before your Majesty, undoubtedly could not but direct an inquiry concerning my conduct. For though I have not been furnished with that abstract, yet I must presume that it described the criminatory contents of these

declarations, much in the same manner, as they are stated in the Report. And the criminatory parts of these declarations, if viewed without reference to those traces of malice and resentment, with which the declarations of Sir John and Lady Douglas abound; if abstracted from all these circumstances, which shew the extreme improbability of the story, the length of time, which my accuser had kept my alleged guilt concealed, the contradictions observable in the declarations of the other witnesses, all which, I submit to your Majesty, are to an extent to cast the greatest discredit upon the truth of these declarations;—abstracted, I say, from these circumstances, the criminatory parts of them were unquestionably such, as to have placed your Majesty under the necessity of directing some inquiry concerning them. But that those, who had the opportunity of reading the long and malevolent narration of Sir John and Lady Douglas, should not have hesitated before they gave any credit to it, is matter of the greatest astonishment to me.

The improbability of the story would of itself, I should have imagined (unless they believed me to be as insane as Lady Douglas insinuates), have been sufficient to have staggered the belief of any unprejudiced mind. For to believe that story, they were to begin with believing that a person guilty of so foul a crime, so highly penal, so fatal to her honour, her station, and her life, should gratuitously and uselessly have confessed it. Such a person under the necessity of concealing her pregnancy, might have been indispensably obliged to confide her secret with those, to whom she was to look for assistance in concealing its consequences. But Lady Douglas, by her own account, was informed by me of this fact, for no purpose whatever. She makes me, as those who read her declarations cannot fail to observe, state to her, that she should, on no account, be entrusted with any part of the management by which the birth was to be concealed.

They were to believe also, that, anxious as I must have been to have concealed the birth of any such child, I had determined to bring it up in my own house; and what would exceed, as I should imagine, the extent of all human credulity, that I had determined to suckle it myself: that I had laid my plan,

if discovered, to have imposed it upon his Royal Highness as his child. Nay, they were to believe, that I had stated, and that Lady Douglas had believed the statement to be true, that I had in fact attempted to suckle it, and only gave up that part of my plan, because it made me nervous, and was too much for my health. And after all this, they were then to believe, that having made Lady Douglas, thus unnecessarily, the confident, of this most important and dangerous secret; having thus put my character and my life in her hands, I sought an occasion, wantonly, and without provocation, from the mere fickleness, and wilfulness of my own mind, to quarrel with her, to insult her openly and violently in my own house, to endeavour to ruin her reputation; to expose her in infamous and indecent drawings enclosed in letters to her husband. The letters, indeed, are represented to have been anonymous, but though anonymous they are stated to have been written with my own hand, so undisguised in penmanship and style, that every one who had the least acquaintance with either, could not fail to discover them, and (as if it were through fear, lest it should not be sufficiently plain from whom they came) that I had sealed them with a seal, which I had shortly before used on occasion of writing to her husband. All this they were to believe upon the declaration of a person, who, with all that loyalty and attachment which she expresses to your Majesty, and his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, with all her obligation to the whole Royal Family, (to whom she expresses herself to be bound by ties of respectful regard and attachment which nothing can ever break;) with all her dread of the mischievous consequences to the country, which might arise, from the disputed succession to the Crown, on the pretensions of an illegitimate child of mine;—nevertheless continued, after this supposed avowal of my infamy, and my crime, after my supposed avowal of my infamy and my supposed acknowledgment of the birth of this child, which was to occasion all this mischief, to preserve, for near a twelvemonth her intimacy and apparent friendship with me; nay, for two years more, after that intimacy had ceased, after that friendship had been broken off by my alleged misbehaviour to her, continued still faithful to my secret, and never disclosed it till (as her declaration states it,) "The

Princess of Wales recommenced a fresh torrent of outrage against Sir John; and Sir John discovered that she was attempting to undermine his and Lady Douglas's character."

Those, then, who had the opportunity of seeing the whole of this narrative, having had their jealousy awakened by these circumstances to the improbability of the story, and to the discredit of the informers when they came to observe, how maliciously every circumstance that imagination could suggest, as most calculated to make a woman contemptible and odious, was scraped and heaped up together in this narrative, must surely have had their eyes opened to the motives of my accusers, and their minds cautioned against giving too easy a credit to their accusation, when they found my conversation to be represented as most loose, and infamous; my mind uninstructed and unwilling to learn; my language, with regard to your Majesty and the whole of your Royal Family, foully disrespectful and offensive; and all my manner and habits of life most disgusting, I should have flattered myself, that I could not have been, in character, so wholly unknown to them, but that they must have observed a spirit, and a colouring at least in this representation, which must have proved much more against the disposition and character of the informers, and the quality of their information, than against the person who was the object of their charge. But when, in addition to all this, the Declaration states, that I had, with respect to my unfortunate and calamitous separation from his Royal Highness, stated that I had acknowledged myself to have been the aggressor, from the beginning, and myself alone; and it then further states, that if any other woman had so played and sported with her husband's comfort and popularity, she would have been turned out of his house, or left alone in it, and have deservedly forfeited *her place in society;* and further still, when, alleging that I had once been desirous of procuring a separation from his Royal Highness, and had pressed former Chancellors to accomplish this purpose, it flippantly adds, that "The Chancellor may now perhaps be able to grant her request." The malicious object of the whole must surely have been most obvious.

For supposing these facts to have been all true; supposing

this infamous and libellous description of my character, had been nothing but a correct and faithful representation of my vices and my infamy, would it not have been natural to have asked why they were introduced into this Declaration? What effect could they have had upon the charge of crime, and of Adultery, which it was intended to establish? If it was only, in execution of a painful duty, which a sense of loyalty to your Majesty, and obedience to the commands of the Prince of Wales at length reluctantly drew from them, why all this malicious accompaniment? "His Royal Highness," indeed they say, "desired that they would communicate the whole circumstances of their acquaintance with me, from the day they first spoke with me till the present time; a full detail of all that passed during our acquaintance," and "how they became known to me, it appearing to his Royal Highness, from the representation of his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, that his Majesty's dearest interests, and those of this country, were very deeply interested in the question," and "that he particularly commanded them to be very circumstantial in their detail respecting all they might know relative to the child that I affected to adopt."

But from the whole of this it is sufficiently apparent, that the particularity of this detail was required, by his Royal Highness, in respect of matters connected with that question, in which the dearest interests of your Majesty and this country were involved; and not of circumstances which could have no bearing on those interests. If it had been therefore true, as I most solemnly protest it is not, that I had in the confidence of private conversation, so far forgot all sense of decency, loyalty, and gratitude, as to have expressed myself with that disrespect of your Majesty which is imputed to me;—If I had been what I trust those who have lived with me, or ever have partaken of my society, would not confirm, of a mind so uninformed and uncultivated, without education or talents, or without any desire of improving myself, incapable of employment, of a temper so furious and violent, as altogether to form a character, which no one could bear to live with, who had the means of living elsewhere;—What possible progress would all this make towards proving that I was guilty of adultery; These, and such like insinuations, as false as they are

malicious, could never have proved crime in me, however manifestly they might display the malice of my accusers.

Must it not, then, have occurred to any one, who had seen the whole of this Narrative, if the motive of my accusers was, as they represent it, merely that of good patriots, of attached and loyal subjects, bound, in execution of a painful duty, imposed upon them by his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, to disclose, in detail, all the facts which could establish my guilt, that these circumstances never would have made a part of their detail? But on the other hand, if their object was to traduce me;—if, falsely attributing to his Royal Highness, sentiments which could belong to no generous bosom, but measuring his nature by their own, they thought, vainly and wickedly, to ingratiate themselves with him, by being the instruments of accomplishing my ruin;—if aiming at depriving me of my rank and station, or of driving me from this country, they determined to bring forward a charge of Treason against me, which, though they knew in their consciences it was false, yet they might hope would serve at least as a cover, and a pretence for such an imputation upon my character, as rendering my life intolerable in this country, might drive me to seek a refuge in another; if, the better to effectuate this purpose, they had represented all my misfortunes as my faults, and my faults alone, drawn an odious and disgusting picture of me, to extinguish every sentiment of pity and compassion, which, in the generosity, not only of your Majesty's royal bosom, and of the members of your Royal Family, but of all the inhabitants of your kingdom, might arise to commiserate the situation of an unfortunate stranger persecuted under a charge originating in their malice;—if, for this they flung out, that I had justly forfeited my station in society, and that a separation from my husband was, what I myself had once wished, and what the Chancellor might now perhaps procure for me—or, if, in short, their object was to obtain my condemnation by prejudice, inflamed by falsehood, which never could be obtained by justice, informed by truth, then the whole texture of the declaration is consistent, and it is well contrived and executed for its purpose. But it is strange, that its purpose should have escaped the detection of intelligent and impartial minds. There was enough at least to have made them pause before they gave such a degree of credit

to informations of this description, as to have made them the foundations of so important and decisive a step, as that of advising them to be laid before your Majesty.

And, indeed, such seems to have been the effect which this declaration at first produced. Because if it had been believed, the only thing to have been done (according to the judgment of the Commissioners,) would have been to have laid it immediately before your Majesty, to whom, upon every principle of duty, the communication was due. But the declaration was made on the 3rd of December, in the last year, and the communication was not made to your Majesty till the very end of May. And that interval appears to have been employed in collecting those other additional declarations, which are referred to in the Report, and which your Majesty has likewise been pleased, by your gracious commands, to have communicated to me.

These additional declarations do not, I submit, appear to furnish much additional reason for believing the incredible story. They were taken indeed—"for the purpose," (for they are so described, this is the title which is prefixed to them in the authentic copies, with which I have been furnished,) "for the purpose of confirming the statement made by Lady Douglas of the circumstances mentioned in her narrative," and they are the examinations of two persons, who appear to have formerly lived in the family of Sir John and Lady Douglas, and of several servants of my own; they are filled with the hearsay details of other servants' declarations. And one of them, W. Cole, seems to have been examined over and over again. No less than four of his examinations are given, and some of these evidently refer to other examinations of his, which are not given at all.

These, I submit to your Majesty, are rendered, from this marked circumstance, particularly undeserving of credit; because, in the only instance in which the hearsay statement, related to one servant, was followed by the examination of the other, who was stated to have made it, (I mean an instance in which Cole relates what he had heard said by F. Lloyd)—F. Lloyd does not appear to have said any such thing, or even to have heard what she is by him related to have said, and she relates the fact that she really did hear, stripped of all the particulars with which Cole had coloured it, and which alone made it in any degree deserving to be men-

tioned. Besides this, the parents of the child which is ascribed to me by Lady Douglas, are plainly pointed out, and a clue is afforded, by which, if followed, it would have been easy to have ascertained, that that child was no child of mine, (if indeed it ever had been seriously believed to be so) and to have proved whose child it was, before the appointment of the Commissioners, as it had been found to be afterwards.

So far, therefore, from concurring with the Commissioners in approving the advice, under which his Royal Highness had acted, I conceive, it to have been at least cruel and inconsiderate, to have advised the transmission of such a charge to your Majesty, till they had exhausted all the means which private inquiry could have afforded, to ascertain its falsehood or its truth.

And when it appears that it was not thought necessary, upon the first statement of it, as the Commissioners seem to have imagined, forthwith to transmit to your Majesty; but it was retained for near six months, from the beginning of December till near the end of May; what is due to myself obliges me to state, that if there had but been in that interval, half the industry employed, to remove suspicious, which was exerted to raise them, there would never have existed a necessity for troubling your Majesty with this charge at all. I beg to be understood as imputing this solely to the advice given to his Royal Highness. He must, of necessity, have left the detail and the determination upon this business to others. And it is evident to me, from what I now know, that his Royal Highness was not fairly dealt with; that material information was obtained, to disprove part of the case against me, which, not appearing in the declarations that were transmitted to your Majesty, I conclude was never communicated to his Royal Highness.

Feeling, Sire, strongly, that I have much to complain of, that this foul charge should have been so readily credited to my great prejudice, as to have occasioned that advice to be given which recommended the transmission of it to your Majesty, (who, once formally in possession of it, could not fail to subject it to some inquiry,) I have dwelt perhaps, at a tedious length, in disputing the propriety of the Commissioners' judgement, in thus approving the course which was pursued. And, looking to the event, and all the circumstances connected with it, perhaps I have rea-

son to rejoice that the Inquiry has taken place. For if three years' concealment of my supposed crime) could not impeach the credit of my accusers, three times that period might perhaps be thought to have left that credit, still unimpaired. And, had the false charge been delayed till death had taken away the real parents of the child, which Lady Douglas charges to be mine; if time had deprived me of those servants and attendants, who have been able so fully to disprove the fact of my alleged pregnancy, I know not where I could have found the means of disproving facts and charges, so falsely, so confidently, and positively, sworn to, as those to which Lady Douglas has attested.

Following, as I proposed, the course taken in the Report, I next come to that part of it, to which unquestionably I must recur with the greatest satisfaction; because it is that part, which so completely absolves me of every possible suspicion, upon the two material charges of pregnancy and child-birth.

The Commissioners state in their Report, that they began by examining "on oath the two principal informants, Sir John and Lady Douglas, who both positively swore, the former to his having observed the fact of pregnancy, and the latter to all the important particulars contained in her former declaration, and above referred to.—Their examinations are annexed to the Report, and are circumstantial and positive. The most material of "the allegations, into the truth of which they had been directed to inquire, being thus far supported by the oath of the parties from whom they had proceeded," they state, "that they felt it their duty to follow up the Inquiry by the examination of such other persons as they judged best able to afford them information, as to the facts in question." "We thought it," they say, "beyond all doubt, that in this course of Inquiry many particulars must be learnt which would be *necessarily conclusive* on the truth or falsehood of these declarations."

So many persons must have been witnesses to the appearance of an actual existing pregnancy, so many circumstances must have been attendant upon a real delivery, and difficulties so numerous and insurmountable must have been involved in any attempt to account for the infant in question, as the child of another woman, if it had been in fact the child of the Princess;

that we entertained a full and confident expectation of arriving at complete proof, either in the affirmative, or negative on this part of the subject." "This expectation," they proceeded to state, "was not disappointed." "We are happy to declare to your Majesty, our perfect conviction that there is no foundation whatever for believing that the child now with the Princess is the child of her Royal Highness, or that she was delivered of any child in the year 1802: nor has any thing appeared to us which would warrant the belief that she was pregnant in that year, or at any other period within the compass of our inquiries." They then proceed to refer to the circumstantial evidence, by which they state that it was proved that the child was, beyond all doubt, born in Brownlow-street Hospital, on the 11th of July, 1802, of the body of Sophia Austin, and brought to my house in November following. "Neither should we," they add, "be more warranted in expressing any doubt that the alleged pregnancy of the Princess, as stated in the original declarations; a fact so fully contradicted, and by so many witnesses, to whom, if true, it must, in various ways, have been known, that we cannot think it entitled to the smallest credit." Then, after stating that they have annexed the depositions from which they have collected these opinions, they add—"We humbly offer to your Majesty our clear and unanimous judgement upon them, formed on full deliberation, and pronounced without hesitation, on the result of the whole Inquiry."

These two most important facts, therefore, which are charged against me, being so fully, and so satisfactorily disposed of, by the unanimous and clear judgment of the Commissioners; being so fully and completely disproved by the evidence which the Commissioners collected, I might, perhaps, in your Majesty's judgment appear well justified, in passing them by without any observation of mine. But though the observations which I shall make shall be very few, yet I cannot forbear just dwelling upon this part of the case, for a few minutes; because, if I do not much deceive myself, upon every principle which can govern the human mind, in the investigation of the truth of any charge, the fate of this part of the accusation must have decisive weight upon the determination of the remainder. I therefore must beg to remark, that Sir John Douglas swears to my

having appeared, some time after our acquaintance had commenced, to be with child; and that one day I leaned on the sofa, and put my hand on my stomach, and said, "Sir John, I shall never be Queen of England;" and he said, "not if you don't deserve," and I seemed angry at first."

This conversation, I apprehend, if it has the least relation to the subject on which Sir John was examined, must be given for the purpose of insinuating that I made an allusion to my pregnancy, as if there was a sort of understanding between him and me upon the subject, and that he made me angry, by an expression which implied, that what I alluded to would forfeit my right to be Queen of England.—If this is not the meaning which Sir John intends to be annexed to the conversation, I am perfectly at a loss to conceive what he can intend to convey. Whether at any time, when I may have felt myself unwell, I may have used the expression, which he here imputes to me, my memory will not enable me, with the least degree of certainty to state. The words themselves seem to me to be perfectly innocent; and the action of laying my hand upon my breast, if occasioned by any sense of internal pain at the moment, neither unnatural, nor, as it appears to me, in any way censurable. But that I could have used these words, intending to convey to Sir John Douglas that meaning, which I suppose him to insinuate, surpasses all human credulity to believe. I could not, however, forbear to notice this passage in Sir John's examination, because it must serve to demonstrate to your Majesty, how words, in themselves most innocent, are endeavoured to be tortured, by being brought into the context with his opinion of my pregnancy, to convey a meaning most contrary to that, which I could by possibility have intended to convey, but which it was necessary that he should impute to me, to give the better colour to this false accusation.

As to Sir John Douglas, however, when he swears to the appearances of my pregnancy, he possibly might be only mistaken. Not that mistake will excuse or diminish the guilt of so scandalous a falsehood upon oath. But for Lady Douglas there cannot be even such an excuse. Independent of all those extravagant confessions which she falsely represents me to have made, she states, upon her own observation and knowledge, that

I was pregnant in the year 1802. Now, in the habits of intercourse and intimacy, with which I certainly did live with her, at that time, she could not be mistaken as to that fact. It is impossible, therefore, that in swearing positively to that fact, which is so positively disproved, she can fail to appear to your Majesty to be wilfully and deliberately forsworn.

As to the conversations which she asserts to have passed between us, I am well aware, that those, who prefer her word to mine, will not be satisfied to disbelieve her upon my bare denial; nor, perhaps, upon the improbability and extravagance of the supposed conversations themselves. But as to the facts of pregnancy and delivery, which are proved to be false, in the words of the Report, "by so many witnesses, to whom, if true, they must in various ways have been known," no person living can doubt that the crime of adultery and treason, as proved by those facts, has been attempted to be fixed upon me, by the deliberate and wilful falsehood of this my most forward accuser. And when it is once established, as it is, that my pregnancy and delivery are all Sir John and Lady Douglas's invention, I should imagine that my confessions of a pregnancy which never existed; my confession of a delivery which never took place; my confession of having suckled a child which I never bore, will hardly be believed upon the credit of her testimony. The credit of Lady Douglas, therefore, being thus destroyed, I trust your Majesty will think that I ought to scorn to answer to any thing which her examination may contain, except so far as there may appear to be any additional and concurrent evidence to support it.

This brings me to the remaining part of the Report, which I read, I do assure your Majesty, with a degree of astonishment and surprise, that I know not how to express. How the Commissioners could, upon such evidence, from such witnesses, upon such an information, and in such an *ex parte* proceeding, before I had had the possibility of being heard, not only suffer themselves to form such an opinion, but to report it to your Majesty, with all the weight and authority of their great names, I am perfectly at a loss to conceive. Their great official and judicial occupations, no doubt, prevented that full attention to the subject which it required. But I am not, surely without just

grounds of complaint, if they proceeded to pronounce an opinion upon my character, without all that consideration and attention, which the importance of it to the peace of your Majesty's mind, to the honour of your Royal Family, and the reputation of the Princess of Wales, seem, indispensably to have demanded.

In the part of the Report already referred to, the particulars of the charge, exclusive of those two important facts, which have been so satisfactorily disposed of, are, as I have already observed, variously described by the Commissioners; as "matters of great impropriety and indecency of behaviour;" as "other particulars in themselves extremely suspicious, and still more so, when connected with the assertions already mentioned;" and as "points of the same nature, though going to a much less extent." But they do not become the subject of particular attention in the Report, till after the Commissioners had concluded that part of it, in which they give so decisive an opinion against the truth of the charge upon two material facts. They then proceed to state, "That they cannot close their Report there," much as they could wish it; that besides the allegations of the pregnancy and delivery of the Princess, those declarations on the whole of which your Majesty had required their Inquiry and Report, contain *other particulars respecting the conduct of Her Royal Highness, such as must, especially considering her exalted rank and station, necessarily give occasion to very unfavourable interpretations.* That from various depositions and proofs annexed to their Report, *particularly from the examination of Robert Bidgood, W. Cole, F. Lloyd, and Mrs. Lisle, several strong circumstances of this description,* have been positively sworn to, by witnesses, *who cannot in the judgment of the Commissioners, be suspected of any unfavourable bias,* and whose veracity in THIS RESPECT, they had *seen no ground to question.*" They then state that "on the precise bearing and effect of the facts, thus appearing, it is not for them to decide, these they submit to your Majesty's wisdom. But they conceive it to be their duty to report on this part of the Inquiry, as distinctly as on the former facts; that as, on the one hand, the facts of pregnancy and delivery are, in their minds, satisfactorily disproved, so on the other hand they think *that the circumstances to which they now refer, particularly*

those stated to have passed between Her Royal Highness and Captain Manby, must be credited until they shall receive some decisive contradiction, and if true are justly entitled to the most serious consideration."

Your Majesty will not fail to observe that the Commissioners have entered into the examination of *this part* of the case, and have reported upon it, not merely as evidence in confirmation of the charges of pregnancy and delivery, which they have completely negatived and disposed of, but as containing substantive matters of charge, in itself.—That they consider it indeed as relating to points "of the same nature, but going to a much less extent," not therefore as constituting actual crime, but as amounting to "improprieties and indecencies of behaviour, aggravated by the exalted rank which I hold," as "occasioning unfavourable interpretations," and as "entitled to the most serious consideration." And when they also state that it is not for them to decide on their precise bearing and effect, I think I am justified in concluding that they could not class them under any known head of crime; as, in that case, upon their bearing and effect they would have been fully competent to have pronounced.

I have, to a degree, already stated to your Majesty, the unprecedented hardships to which I conceive myself to have been exposed, by this *ex parte* inquiry into the decorum of my private conduct. I have already stated the prejudice done to my character, by this recorded censure, from which I can have no appeal: and I press these considerations no further upon your Majesty, at present, than to point out in passing this part of the Report, the just foundations which it affords me for making the complaint.

Your Majesty will also, I am persuaded, not fail to remark the strange obscurity and reserve, the mysterious darkness, with which the Report here expresses itself; and every one must feel how this aggravates the severity and cruelty of the censure, by rendering it impossible distinctly and specifically to meet it. The Commissioners state indeed that some things are proved against me, which must be credited till they shall receive a decisive contradiction, but what those things are they do not state. They are "particulars and circumstances, which, especially con-
"sidering my exalted rank, must give occasion to the most un-

" favourable interpretations. There are several strong circum-
" stances of this description," " they are, if true, justly deserving
" of the most serious consideration," and they " must be credited
" till decidedly contradicted." But what are these circumstances? What are these deeds without a name? Was there ever a charge so framed? Was ever any one put to answer any charge, and decidedly to contradict it, or submit to have it credited against him, which was conceived in such terms without the means of ascertaining what these things are, except as conjecture may enable me to surmise, to what parts of the examinations of the four witnesses on whom they particularly rely, they attach the importance and the weight which seem to them to justify these dark and ambiguous censures on my conduct? But such as they are, and whatever they may be, they must, your Majesty is told, be credited, unless they are decidedly contradicted.

Circumstances, respecting Captain Manby, indeed, are particularized; but, referring to the depositions which apply to him, they contain much matter of opinion, of hearsay, of suspicion. Are these hearsays, are these opinions, are these suspicions, and conjectures, of these witnesses, to be believed against me, unless decidedly contradicted? How can I decidedly contradict another person's opinion? I may reason against its justice, but how can I contradict it? Or how can I decidedly contradict any thing which is not precisely specified, nor distinctly known to me?

Your Majesty will also observe that the Report states, that it is not for the Commissioners to decide upon the bearing and effect of these facts; these are left for your Majesty's decision. But they add, that, if true, they are justly entitled to the most serious consideration. I cannot, Sire, but collect from these passages an intimation, that some further proceedings may be meditated. And, perhaps, if I acted with perfect prudence, seeing how much reason I have to fear from the fabrications of falsehood, I ought to have waited till I knew what course, civil or criminal, your Majesty might be advised to pursue, before I offered any observations or answer. To this alternative, however, I am driven. I must either remain silent, and reserve my defence, leaving the imputation to operate most injuriously and

fatally to my character, or I must, by entering into a defence against so extended a charge, expose myself with much greater hazard to any future attacks. But the fear of *possible* danger, to arise from the perverted interpretation of my answer, cannot induce me to acquiesce under the *certain* mischief of the unjust censure and judgment which stands against me, as it were, recorded in this Report. I shall, therefore, at whatever hazard, proceed to submit to your Majesty, in whose justice I have the most satisfactory reliance, my answer and my observation upon this part of the case.

And here, Sire, I cannot forbear again presuming to state to your Majesty, that it is not a little hard, that the Commissioners (who state in the beginning of their Report, that certain particulars, in themselves extremely suspicious, were, in the judgment which they had formed upon them, before they entered into the particulars of the Inquiry, rendered still more suspicious from being connected with the assertion of pregnancy and delivery,) should have made no observation upon the degree in which that suspicion must be proportionably abated, when those assertions of pregnancy and delivery have been completely falsified and disproved; that they should make no remark upon the fact, that all the witnesses, (with the exception of Mrs. Lisle,) on whom they specifically rely, were, every one of them, brought forward by the principal informers, for the purpose of supporting the false statement of Lady Douglas; that they are the witnesses therefore of persons, whom, after the complete falsification of their charge, I am justified in describing as conspirators, who have been detected in supporting their conspiracy by their own perjury. And, surely, where a conspiracy, to fix a charge upon an individual, has been plainly detected, the witnesses of those who have been so detected in that conspiracy,—witnesses that are brought forward to support this false charge,—cannot stand otherwise than considerably affected in their credit, by their connection with those who are detected in that conspiracy. But, instead of pointing out this circumstance, as calling, at least, for some degree of caution and reserve, in considering the testimony of these witnesses, the Report, on the contrary, holds them up as worthy of particular credit as witnesses, who,

in the judgment of the Commissioners, cannot be suspected of unfavourable bias; whose veracity, in that respect, they have seen no ground to question; and, who must be credited till they receive some decided contradiction.

Now, Sire, I feel the fullest confidence that I shall prove to your Majesty's most perfect satisfaction, that of all these witnesses (of course, I still exclude Mrs. Lisle) are under the influence, and exhibit the symptoms of the most unfavourable bias;—that their veracity is, in every respect, to be doubted;—and that, they cannot, by any candid and attentive mind, be deemed worthy of the least degree of credit. Upon this charge, your Majesty will easily conceive, how great my surprise and astonishment must have been at this part of the Report. I am, indeed, a little at a loss to know whether I understand the passage which I have cited from the Report:—"The witnesses "in the judgment of the Commissioners, are not to be suspected "of unfavourable bias, and their veracity, *in that respect*, they "have seen no reason to question." What is meant by their having seen no reason to suspect their veracity *in that respect?* Do they mean, what the qualification seems to imply, that they have seen reason to question it in other respects? Is it meant to be insinuated that they saw reason to question their veracity, not in respect of an unfavourable bias, but of a bias in my favour? I cannot impute to them such an insinuation, because I am satisfied that the Commissioners would never have intended to insinuate any thing so directly contrary to the truth.

The witnesses specifically pointed out, as thus particularly deserving of credit, are W. Cole, R. Bidgood, F. Lloyd, and Mrs. Lisle. With respect to Mrs. Lisle, I trust your Majesty will permit me to make my observations upon her examination, as distinctly and separately as I possibly can, from the others. Because, as I ever had, and have now as much as ever, the most perfect respect for Mrs. Lisle, I would avoid the possibility of having it imagined that such observations as I shall be under the absolute necessity of making upon the other witnesses could be intended, in any degree, to be applied to her.

With respect to Cole, Bidgood, and Lloyd, they have all lived in their places, for a long time; they had lived with his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales before he married, and were ap-

pointed by him to situations about me; Cole and Lloyd immediately upon my marriage, and Bidgood very shortly afterwards. I know not whether from this circumstance they may consider themselves as not owing that undivided duty and regard to me, which servants of my own appointment might possibly have felt; but, if I knew nothing more of them than that they had consented to be voluntarily examined, for the purpose of supporting the statement of Lady Douglas on a charge so deeply affecting my honour, without communicating to me the fact of such examination, your Majesty would not, I am sure, be surprised to find that I saw, in that circumstance alone, sufficient to raise *some* suspicions of an unfavourable bias. But, when I find Cole, particularly, submitting to this secret and voluntary examination against me, no less than *four* times, and when I found, during the pendency of this Inquiry before the Commissioners, that one of them, R. Bidgood, was so far connected and in league with Sir John and Lady Douglas, as to have communication with the latter, I thought I saw the proof of such decided hostility and confederacy against me, that I felt obliged to order the discontinuance of his attendance at my house till further orders. Of the real bias of their minds, however, with respect to me, your Majesty will be better able to judge from the consideration of their evidence.

The imputations which I collect to be considered as cast upon me, by these several witnesses, are, too great familiarity and intimacy with several gentlemen, Sir Sidney Smith, Mr. Lawrence, Captain Manby; and I know not whether the same are not meant to be extended to Lord Hood, Mr. Chester, and Captain Moore.

With your Majesty's permission, therefore, I will examine the depositions of the witnesses, as they respect these several gentlemen, in their order, keeping the evidence, which is applicable to each case, as distinct from the others as I can.

And I will begin with those which respect Sir Sidney Smith, as he is the person first mentioned in the deposition of W. Cole. W. Cole says, "that Sir Sidney Smith first visited at Montague House in 1802; that he observed that the Princess was too familiar with Sir Sidney Smith. One day, he thinks in February, he (Cole) carried into the Blue Room, to

the Princess, some sandwiches which she had ordered, and was surprised to see that Sir Sidney was there. He must have come in from the Park. If he had been let in from Blackheath, he must have passed through the room in which he (Cole) was waiting. When he had left the sandwiches, he returned, after some time, into the room, and Sir Sidney Smith was sitting very close to the Princess on the sofa. He (Cole) looked at her Royal Highness; she caught his eye, and saw that he noticed the manner in which they were sitting together; they appeared both a little confused.

R. Bidgood says also, in his deposition, on the 6th of June, (for he was examined twice) "that it was early in 1802 that he first observed Sir Sidney Smith come to Montague House. He used to stay very late at night; he had seen him early in the morning there, about ten or eleven o'clock. He was at Sir John Douglas's, and was in the habit, as well as Sir John and Lady Douglas, of dining or having luncheon, or supping there every day. He saw Sir Sidney Smith, one day in 1802, in the Blue Room, about eleven o'clock in the morning, which was full two hours before they expected ever to see company. He asked the servants why they did not let him know Sir Sidney Smith was there: the footmen told him that they had let no person in. There was a private door to the Park, by which he might have come in if he had a key to it, and have got into the Blue Room without any of the servants perceiving him. And in his second deposition, taken on the 3rd of July, he says he lived at Montague House when Sir Sidney came. Her (the Princess's) manner with him appeared very familiar; she appeared attentive to him, but he did not suspect any thing further.

Mrs. Lisle says that the Princess at one time appeared to like Sir John and Lady Douglas. "I have seen Sir Sidney Smith there very late in the evening, but not alone with the Princess. I have no reason to suspect he had a key of the Park-gate: I never heard of any body being found wandering about at Blackheath."

Fanny Lloyd does not mention Sir Sidney Smith in her deposition.

Upon the whole of this evidence, then, which is the whole that respects Sir Sidney Smith, in any of these depositions (except

some particular passages in Cole's evidence, which are so important as to require very particular and distinct statement) I would request your Majesty to understand that, with respect to the fact of Sir Sidney Smith's visiting frequently at Montague House, both with Sir John and Lady Douglas, and without them; with respect to his being frequently there, at luncheon, dinner and supper; and staying with the rest of the company till twelve, and one o'clock, or even sometimes later, if these are some of the facts "which must give occasion to unfavourable interpretations, "and must be credited till they are contradicted; they are facts, which I never can contradict, for they are perfectly true. And I trust it will imply the confession of no guilt, to admit that Sir Sidney Smith's conversation, his account of the various and extraordinary events, and heroic achievements, in which he had been concerned, amused and interested me; and the circumstance of his living so much with his friends, Sir John and Lady Douglas, in my neighbourhood on Blackheath, gave the opportunity of his increasing his acquaintance with me.

It happened, also, that about this time I fitted up, as your Majesty may have observed, one of the rooms in my house after the fashion of a Turkish tent. Sir Sidney furnished me with a pattern for it, in a drawing of the tent of Murat Bey, which he had brought over with him from Egypt. And he taught me how to draw Egyptian Arabesques, which were necessary for the ornaments of the cieling; this may have occasioned, while that room was fitting up, several visits, and possibly some, though I do not recollect them, as early in the morning as Mr. Bidgood mentions. I believe, also, that it has happened more than once, that, walking with my ladies in the Park, we have met Sir Sidney Smith, and that he has come in with us, through the gate from the Park. My ladies may have gone up to take off their cloaks, or to dress, and have left me alone with him: and, at some one of these times, it may very possibly have happened that Mr. Cole and Mr. Bidgood may have seen him, when he has not come through the waiting-room, nor been let in by any of the footmen. But, I solemnly declare to your Majesty, that I have not the least idea or belief that he ever had a key of the gate into the Park, or that he ever entered in or passed out at that gate, except in company with myself and my ladies. As for the

circumstance of my permitting him to be in the room alone with me, if suffering a man to be so alone is evidence of guilt, from whence the Commissioners can draw any unfavourable inference, I must leave them to draw it. For I cannot deny that it has happened, and happened frequently; not only with Sir Sidney Smith but with many, many others; gentlemen who have visited me; tradesmen who have come to receive my orders; masters whom I have had to instruct me, in painting, in music, in English, &c. that I have received them without any one being by. In short, I trust I am not confessing a crime, for unquestionably, it is a truth, that I never had an idea that there was any thing wrong, or objectionable, in thus seeing men in the morning; and I confidently believe your Majesty will see nothing in it from which any guilt can be inferred. I feel certain that there is nothing immoral in the thing itself; and I have always understood, that it was perfectly customary and usual for ladies of the first rank, and the first character, in the country, to receive the visits of the gentlemen in the morning, though they might be themselves alone at the time. But if, in the opinions and fashions of this country, there should be more impropriety ascribed to it than what it ever entered into my mind to conceive, I hope your Majesty, and every candid mind, will make allowance for the different notions which my foreign education and foreign habits may have given me.

But whatever character may belong to this practice, it is not a practice which commenced after my leaving Carlton-House. While there, and from my first arrival in this country, I was accustomed, with the knowledge of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and without his ever having hinted to me the slightest disapprobation, to receive lessons from various masters for my amusement and improvement; I was attended by them, frequently from twelve o'clock till five in the afternoon;—Mr. Atwood for music, Mr. Geffadiere for English, Mr. Tourfronelli for painting, Mr. Tutoye for imitating marble, Mr. Elwes for the harp. I saw them all alone; and, indeed, if I were to see them at all, I could do no otherwise than see them alone. Miss Garth, who was then sub-governess to my daughter, lived, certainly, under the same roof with me, but she could not be spared from her duty and attendance on my daughter. I desired her

sometimes to come down stairs, and read to me, during the time when I drew or painted, but my Lord Cholmondely informed me this could not be. I then requested that I might have one of my bed-chamber women to live constantly at Carlton-House, that I might have her at call whenever I wanted her; but I was answered that it was not customary that the attendants of the Royal Family should live with them in town; so that request could not be complied with. But, independent of this, I never conceived that it was offensive to the fashions and manners of the country to receive gentlemen who might call upon me in the morning, whether I had or had not any one with me; and it never occurred to me to think that there was either impropriety or indecorum in it, at that time, nor in continuing the practice at Montague House. But this has been confined to morning visits, in no private apartments in my house, but in my drawing-room, where my ladies have at all times free access; and as they usually take their luncheon with me, except when they are engaged with visitors, or pursuits of their own, it could but rarely occur that I could be left with any gentlemen alone for any length of time, unless there were something, in the known and avowed business, which might occasion his waiting upon me, that would fully account for the circumstance.

I trust your Majesty will excuse the length at which I have dwelt upon this topic. I perceive, from the examinations, that it had been much inquired after, and I felt it necessary to represent it in its true light. And the candour of your Majesty's mind will, I am confident, suggest, that those who are the least conscious of intending guilt are the least suspicious of having it imputed to them; and, therefore, that they do not think it necessary to guard themselves, at every turn, with witnesses to prove their innocence, fancying their character to be safe as long as their conduct is innocent, and that guilt will not be imputed to them from actions quite indifferent.

The deposition, however, of Mr. Cole is not confined to my being alone with Sir Sidney Smith. The circumstances in which he observed us together he particularizes, and states his opinion. He introduces, indeed, the whole of the evidence, by saying that I was too familiar with Sir Sidney Smith; but, as I trust I am not yet so far degraded as to have my character decided by the

opinion of Mr. Cole, I shall not comment upon that observation. He then proceeds to describe the scene which he observed on the day when he brought in the sandwiches, which, I trust your Majesty did not fail to notice, *I had myself ordered to be brought in.* For, there is an obvious insinuation that Sir Sidney must have come in through the Park, and that there was great impropriety in his being alone with me. And at least the witness's own story proves, whatever impropriety there might be in this circumstance, that I was not conscious of it, nor meant to take advantake of his clandestine entry from the Park to conceal the fact from my servants' observation. For if I had had such consciousness, or such meaning, I never could have ordered sandwiches to have been brought in, or any other act to have been done, which must have brought myself under the notice of my servants, while I continued in a situation which I thought improper and wished to conceal. Any of the circumstances of this visit, to which this part of the deposition refers, my memory does not enable me in the least degree to particularize and recal. Mr. Cole may have seen me sitting on the same sofa with Sir Sidney Smith. Nay, I have no doubt he must have seen me, over and over again, not only with Sir Sidney Smith, but with other gentlemen, sitting upon the same sofa; and I trust your Majesty will feel it the hardest thing imaginable, that I should be called upon to account what corner of a sofa I sat upon four years ago, and how close Sir Sidney Smith was sitting to me. I can only solemnly aver to your Majesty, that my conscience supplies me with the fullest means of confidently assuring you, that I never permitted Sir Sidney Smith to sit on any sofa with me in any manner, which, in my own judgment was in the slightest degree offensive to the strictest propriety and decorum. In the judgment of many persons, perhaps, a Princess of Wales should at no time forget the elevation of her rank, or descend in any degree to the familiarities and intimacies of private life. Under any circumstances, this would be a hard condition to be annexed to her situation. Under the circumstances, in which it has been my misfortune to have lost the necessary support to the dignity and station of a Princess of Wales, to have assumed and maintained an unbending dignity would have been impossible; and, if possible, could hardly have been expected from me.

After these observations, Sire, I must now request your Majesty's attention to those written declarations which are mentioned in the Report, and which I shall never be able sufficiently to thank your Majesty for having condescended, in compliance with my earnest request, to order to be transmitted to me. From observations upon those declarations themselves, as well as upon comparing them with the depositions made before the Commissioners, your Majesty will see the strongest reason for discrediting the testimony of W. Cole, as well as others of these witnesses whose credit stands in the opinion of the Commissioners so unimpeachable. They supply important observations, even with respect to that part of Mr. Cole's evidence which I am now considering, though in no degree equal in importance to those which I shall afterwards have occasion to notice.

Your Majesty will please to observe, that there are no less than four different examinations, or declarations, of Mr. Cole. They are dated on the 11th, 14th, and 30th of January, and on 23rd of February. In these four different declarations he twice mentions the circumstance of finding Sir Sidney Smith and myself on the sofa; and he mentions it not only in a different manner, at each of those times, but at both of them in a manner which materially differs from his deposition before the Commissioners. In his declaration on the 11th of January, he says, he found us in so *familiar* a posture as to *alarm* him very much, which he expressed by a *start back* and a look at the gentleman.

In that dated the 23rd of February, however, (being asked, I suppose, as to that which he had dared to assert, of the familiar posture which had alarmed him so much,) he says, "there was "*nothing particular* in our dress, *position* of legs, or arms, that "was extraordinary; he thought it improper that a single "gentleman should be sitting quite close to a married lady on "the sofa, and from *that* situation and *former observations* he "thought the thing improper." In this second account, therefore, your Majesty perceives he was obliged to bring in his former observation to help out the statement, in order to account for his having been so shocked with what he saw, as to express his alarm by "starting back." But, unfortunately, he accounts for it, as it seems to me at least, by the very circumstance

which would have induced him to have been less surprised, and, consequently, less startled by what he saw; for, had his former observations been such as he insinuates, he would have been prepared the more to expect, and the less to be surprised at, what he pretends to have seen.

But your Majesty will observe, that in his deposition before the Commissioners, (recollecting perhaps how awkwardly he had accounted for his starting in his former declaration,) he drops his starting altogether. Instead of looking at the gentleman only, he looked at us both; that I caught his eye, and saw that he noticed the manner in which we were sitting, and instead of his own starting, or any description of the manner in which he exhibited his own feelings, we are represented as both appearing a *little confused.* Our *confusion* is a circumstance, which during his four declarations, which he made before the appointment of the Commissioners, it never once occurred to him to recollect. And now he does recollect it, we appeared, he says, "a little confused."—A little confused!—The Princess of Wales detected in a situation such as to shock and alarm her servant, and so detected as to be sensible of her detection, and so conscious of the impropriety of the situation as to exhibit symptons of confusion! Would not her confusion have been extreme? Would it have been so little as to have slipped the memory of the witness who observed it, during his first four declarations, and at last to be recalled to his recollection in such a manner as to be represented in the faint and feeble way in which he here describes it?

What weight your Majesty will ascribe to these differences in the accounts given by this witness, I cannot pretend to say. But I am ready to confess that, probably, if there was nothing stronger of the same kind to be observed, in other parts of his testimony, the inference which would be drawn from them would depend very much upon the opinion previously entertained of the witness. To me, who know many parts of his testimony to be absolutely false, and all the colouring given to it to be wholly from his own wicked and malicious invention, it appears plain, that these differences in his representations are the unsteady, awkward, shuffles and prevarications of falsehood. To those, if there are any such, who from preconceived prejudices in his

favour, or from any other circumstances, think that his veracity is free from all suspicion, satisfactory means of reconciling them may possibly occur. But before I have left Mr. Cole's examinations, your Majesty will find that they will have much more to account for, and much more to reconcile.

Mr. Cole's examination before the Commissioners goes on thus:—"A short time before this, one night about twelve "o'clock, I saw a man go into the house from the Park, wrapt "up in a great coat. I did not give any alarm, for the impres-"sion on my mind was, that it was not a thief." When I read this passage, Sire, I could hardly believe my eyes, when I found such a fact left in this dark state, without any further explanation, or without a trace in the examination of any attempt to get it further explained. How he got this impression on his mind, that this was not a thief? Whom he believed it to be? What part of the house he saw him enter? If the drawing-room, or any part which I usually occupy, who was there at the time? Whether I was there? Whether alone, or with my Ladies? or with other company? Whether he told any body of the circumstance at the time? or how long after? Whom he told? Whether any inquiries were made in consequence? These, and a thousand other questions, with a view to have penetrated into the mystery of this strange story, and to have tried the credit of this witness, would, I should have thought, have occurred to any one: but certainly must have occurred to persons so experienced, and so able in the examination of facts, and the trying of the credit of witnesses, as the two learned Lords unquestionably are, whom your Majesty took care to have introduced into this Commission. They never could have permitted these unexplained and unsifted hints and insinuations to have had the weight and effect of proof.—But, unfortunately for me, the duties, probably, of their respective situations prevented their attendance on the examination of this, and on the first examination of another most important witness, Mr. Robert Bidgood—and surely your Majesty will permit me here, without offence, to complain, that it is not a little hard, that, when your Majesty had shewn your anxiety to have legal accuracy and legal experience assist on this examination, the two most important witnesses, in whose examinations there is more matter for unfavourable interpretation than in all

the rest put together, should have been examined without the benefit of this accuracy and this experience. And I am the better justified in making this observation, if what has been suggested to me is correct; that, if it shall not be allowed that the power of administering an oath under this warrant or commission is questionable, yet it can hardly be doubted, that it is most questionable whether, according to the terms or meaning of the warrant or commission, as it constitutes no *quorum*, Lord Spencer and Lord Grenville could administer an oath, or act in the absence of the other Lords; and, if they could not, Mr. Cole's falsehood must be out of the reach of punishment.

Returning, then, from this digression, will your Majesty permit me to ask, whether I am to understand this fact, respecting the man in a great coat, to be one of those which must necessarily give occasion to the most unfavourable interpretations? which must be credited till decidedly contradicted? and which, if true, deserve the most serious consideration? The unfavourable interpretations which this fact may occasion, doubtless are, that this man was either Sir Sidney Smith, or some other *paramour*, who was admitted by me into my house in disguise at midnight, for the accomplishment of my wicked and adulterous purposes. And is it possible that your Majesty, is it possible that any candid mind, can believe this fact, with the unfavourable interpretations which it occasions, on the relation of a servant, who, for all that appears, mentions it, for the first time, four years after the event took place; and who gives, himself, this picture of his honesty and fidelity to a master whom he has served so long, that he, whose nerves are of so moral a frame, that he starts at seeing a single man sitting at mid-day, in an open drawing-room, on the same sofa with a married woman, permitted this disguised midnight adulterer, to approach his master's bed, without taking any notice, without making any alarm, without offering any interruption. And why? because (as he expressly states) he did not believe him to be a thief: and because (as he plainly insinuates) he did believe him to be an adulterer.

But what makes the manner in which the commissioners suffered this fact to remain so unexplained, the more extraordinary is this; Mr. Cole had in his original declaration of the 11th of January, which was before the Commissioners, stated "that one

night about twelve o'clock, he saw a person wrapped up in a great coat, go across the Park into the gate at the Green House, and he verily believes it was Sir Sidney Smith." In his declaration then, (when he was not upon oath) he ventures to state, " that he verily believes it was Sir Sidney Smith." When he is upon his oath, in his depositions before the Commissioners, all that he ventures to swear is, " that he gave no alarm, because the impression upon his mind was, that it was not a thief!!" I believe him, and the impression upon my mind too is, that he *knew* it was not a thief—that he knew who it was—and that he knew it was no other than *my watchman.* What incident it is that he alludes to, I cannot pretend to know. But this I know, that if it refers to any man with whose proceedings I have the least acquaintance or privity, it must have been my watchman; who if he executes my orders, nightly, and often in the night goes his rounds, both inside and outside of my house. And this circumstance, which I should think would rather afford, to most minds, an inference that I was not preparing the way of planning facilities for secret midnight assignations, has, in my conscience, I believe, (if there is one word of truth in any part of this story, and the whole of it is not pure invention) afforded the handle, and suggested the idea, to this honest, trusty man, this witness, " who cannot be suspected of any unfavourable bias," " whose veracity in that respect the Commissioners saw no ground to question," and " who must be credited till he received decided contradiction," suggested, I say, the idea of the dark and vile insinuation contained in this part of his testimony.

Whether I am right or wrong, however, in this conjecture, this appears to be evident, that his examination is so left, that supposing an indictment for perjury or false swearing, would lie against any witness, examined by the Commissioners, and supposing this examination had been taken before the whole four,— If Mr. Cole was indicted for perjury, in respect to thisdeposition, the proof that he did see the watchman, would necessarily acquit him; would establish the truth of what he said, and rescue him from the punishment of perjury, though it would at the same time prove the falsehood and injustice of the inference, and the insinuation, for the establishment of which alone the fact itself was sworn.

Mr. Cole chooses further to state, that he ascribes his removal from Montague House to London, to the discovery he had made, and the notice he had taken of the improper situation of Sir Sidney Smith with me upon the sofa. To this I can oppose but little more than my own assertions, as my motives can only be known to myself.—But Mr. Cole was a very disagreeable servant to me: he was a man, who, as I always conceived, had been educated above his station. He talked French, and was a musician, playing well on the violin.—By these qualifications he got admitted occasionally, into better company, and this probably led to that forward and obtrusive conduct, which I thought extremely offensive and impertinent in a servant. I had long been extremely displeased with him; I had discovered, that when I went out, he would come into my drawing-room, and play on my harpsichord, or sit there reading books;—and, in short, there was a forwardness which would have led to my absolutely discharging him a long time before, if I had not made a sort of rule to myself, to forbear, as long as possible, from removing any servant who had been placed about me by his Royal Highness. Before Mr. Cole lived with the Prince, he had lived with the Duke of Devonshire, and I had reason to believe that he carried to Devonshire House all the observations he could make at mine. For these various reasons, just before the Duke of Kent was about to go out of the kingdom, I requested his Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, who had been good enough to take the trouble of arranging many particulars in my establishment, to take the arrangements with respect to Mr. Cole; which was, to leave him in town to wait upon me only when I went to Carlton House, and not to come to Montague House, except when especially required. This arrangement, it seems, offended him. It certainly deprived him of some perquisites which he had when living at Blackheath; but, upon the whole, as it left him so much more of his time at his own disposal, I should not have thought it had been much to his prejudice. It seems, however, that he did not like it, and I must leave this part of the case with this one observation more—That your Majesty, I trust, will hardly believe, that, if Mr. Cole had, by any accident, discovered any improper conduct of mine, towards Sir Sidney Smith, or any one else, the way which I should have taken to suppress his information, to

close his mouth, would not have been by immediately adopting an arrangement in my family, which was either prejudical or disagreeable to him: or that the way to remove him from the opportunity and the temptation of betraying my secrets, whether through levity or design, in the quarter where it would be most fatal to me that it should be known, was by making an arrangement which, while all his resentment and anger were fresh and warm about him, would place him frequently, nay, almost daily, at Carlton House; would place him precisely at that place, from whence, unquestionably, it must have been my interest to have kept him as far removed as possible.

There is little or nothing in the examinations of the other witnesses which is material for me to observe upon, as far as respects this part of the case. It appears from them indeed, what I have had no difficulty in admitting, and have observed upon before, that Sir Sidney Smith was frequently at Montague House, that they have known him to be alone with me in the morning, but that they never knew him alone with me in an evening, or staying later than my company or the Ladies—for what Mr. Stikeman says, with respect to his being alone with me in an evening, can only mean, and is only reconcileable with all the rest of the evidence on this part of the case, by its being understood to mean alone, in respect of other company, but not alone, in the absence of my Ladies. The deposition indeed of my servant, S. Roberts, is thus far material upon that point, that it exhibits Mr. Cole, not less than three years ago, endeavouring to collect evidence upon these points to my prejudice. For your Majesty will find that he says, "I recollect Mr. Cole once asking me, I think three years ago, whether there were any favourites in the family. I remember saying that Captain Manby and Sir Sidney Smith were frequently at Blackheath, and dined there oftener than other persons." He then proceeds, "I never knew Sir Sidney Smith stay later than the Ladies: I cannot exactly say at what time he went, but I never remember his staying alone with the Princess."

As to what is contained in the written declarations of Mr, and Mrs. Lampert, the old servants of Sir John and Lady Douglas, (as from some circumstance or other respecting, I conceive, either their credit or their supposed importance,) the Commis-

sioners have not thought proper to examine them upon their oaths, I do not imagine your Majesty would expect that I should take any notice of them. And as to what is deposed by Lady Douglas, if your Majesty will observe the gross and horrid indecencies with which she ushers in, and states my confessions to her, of my assented criminal intercourse with Sir Sidney Smith, your Majesty, I am confident, will not be surprised that I do not descend to any particular observations on her deposition. One, and one only observation will I make, which, however, could not have escaped Your Majesty, if I had omitted it. That your Majesty will have an excellent portraiture of the true female delicacy and purity of Lady Douglas's mind and character, when you will observe that she seems wholly insensible to what a sink of infamy she degrades herself by her testimony against me. It is not only that it appears, from her statement, that she was contented to live, in familiar and apparent friendship with me, after the confession which I made of my adultery, (for by the indulgence and liberality, as it is called, of modern manners, the company of adulteresses has ceased to reflect that discredit upon the characters of other women who admit them to their society, which the best interests of female virtue may perhaps require.) But she was content to live in familiarity with a woman, who if Lady Douglas's evidence of me is true, was a most low, vulgar, and profligate disgrace to her sex. The grossness of whose ideas and conversation, would add infamy to the lowest, most vulgar, and most infamous prostitute. It is not, however, upon this circumstance, that I rest assured no reliance can be placed on Lady Douglas's testimony: but after what is proved, with regard to her evidence respecting my pregnancy and delivery in 1802, I am certain that any observations upon her testimony, or her veracity, must be flung away.

Your Majesty has therefore now before you the state of the charge against me, as far as respects Sir Sidney Smith. And this is, as I understand the Report, one of the charges *which, with its unfavourable interpretations, must in the opinion of the Commissioners, be credited till decidedly contradicted.*

As to the facts of frequent visiting on terms of great intimacy, as I have said before, they cannot be contradicted at all. How inferences, and unfavourable interpretations, are to be decidedly

contradicted, I wish the Commissioners had been so good as to explain. I know of no possible way, but by the declaration of myself and Sir Sidney Smith. Yet we being the supposed guilty parties, our denial, probably, will be thought of no great weight. As to my own, however, I tender it to your Majesty, in the most solemn manner, and if I knew what fact it was that I ought to contradict, to clear my innocence, I would precisely address myself to that fact, as I am confident, my conscience would enable me to do, to any from which a criminal or an unbecoming inference could be drawn. I am sure, however, your Majesty will feel for the humiliated and degraded situation, to which this report has reduced your Daughter-in-law, the Princess of Wales; when you see her reduced to the necessity of either risking the danger, that the most unfavourable interpretations should be credited; or else of stating, as I am now degraded to the necessity of stating, that not only no adulterous or criminal, but no indecent or improper intercourse whatever, ever subsisted between Sir Sidney Smith and myself, or any thing which I should have objected that all the world should have seen. I say degraded to the necessity of stating it; for your Majesty must feel that a woman's character is degraded when it is put upon her to make such statement, at the peril of the contrary being credited unless she decidedly contradicts it. Sir Sidney Smith's absence from the country prevents my calling upon him to attest the same truth. But I trust when your Majesty shall find, as you will find, that my declaration to a similar effect, with respect to the other gentlemen referred to in this Report, is confirmed by their denial, that your Majesty will think that in a case, where nothing but my own word, can be adduced, my own word alone may be opposed to whatever little remains of credit or weight may, after all the above observations, be supposed yet to belong to Mr. Cole, to his inferences, his insinuations, or his facts. Not indeed that I yet have finished my observations on Mr. Cole's credit; but I must reserve the remainder, till I consider his evidence with respect to Mr. Lawrence; and till I have occasion to comment upon the testimony of Fanny Lloyd. Then, indeed, I shall be under the necessity of exhibiting to your Majesty these witnesses, Fanny Lloyd and Mr. Cole, (both of whom are represented as so unbiassed, and so credible) in flat, decisive,

and irreconcileable contradiction to each other.

The next person, with whom my improper intimacy is insinuated, is Mr. Lawrence the painter.

The principal witness on this charge is also Mr. Cole, Mr. R. Bidgood says nothing about him, Fanny Lloyd says nothing about him; and all that Mrs. Lisle says is perfectly true, and I am neither able, nor feel interested to contradict it. "That she "remembers my sitting to Mr. Lawrence for my picture at Black- "heath, and in London; that she has left me at his house in "town with him, but she thinks Mrs. Fitzgerald was with us; "and that she thinks I sat alone with him at Blackheath." But Mr. Cole speaks of Mr. Lawrence in a manner that calls for particular observation. He says "Mr. Lawrence the painter "used to go to Montague House about the latter end of 1801, "when he was painting the Princess, and he has slept in the "house two or three nights together. I have often seen him "alone with the Princess at 11 or 12 o'clock at night. He has "been there as late as one or two o'clock in the morning. One "night I saw *him with the Princess in the Blue Room, after "the ladies had retired. Some time afterwards, when I sup- "posed he had gone to his room, I went to see that all was safe, "and I found the Blue Room door locked, and heard a whisper- "ing in it, and I went away.*" Here, again, your Majesty observes, that Mr. Cole deals his deadliest blows against my character by insinuation. And here, again his insinuation is left unsifted and unexplained. I here understand him to insinuate that, though he supposed Mr. Lawrence to have gone to his room, he was still where he had said he last left him; and that the locked door prevented him from seeing me and Mr. Lawrence alone together, whose whispering, however, he notwithstanding overheard.

Before, Sire, I come to my own explanation of the fact of Mr. Lawrence's sleeping at Montague House, I must again refer to Mr. Cole's original declarations. I must again examine Mr. Cole against Mr. Cole: which I cannot help lamenting it does not seem to have occurred to others to have done, as I am persuaded if it had, his prevarications, and his falsehood, could never have escaped them. They would then have been able to have traced, as your Majesty will now do, through my observa-

tions, by what degrees he hardened himself up to the infamy (for I can use no other expression) of stating this fact, by which he means to insinuate that he heard me and Mr. Lawrence, locked up in this Blue Room, whispering together, and alone. I am sorry to be obliged to drag your Majesty through so long a detail; but I am confident your Majesty's goodness, and love of justice, will excuse it, as it is essential to the vindication of my character, as well as to the illustration of Mr. Cole's.

Mr. Cole's examination, as contained in his first written declaration of the 11th of January, has nothing of this. I mean not to say that it has nothing concerning Mr. Lawrence, for it has much, which is calculated to occasion unfavourable interpretations, and given with a view to that object. But that circumstance, as I submit to your Majesty, increases the weight of my observation. Had there been nothing in his first declaration about Mr. Lawrence at all, it might have been imagined that perhaps Mr. Lawrence escaped his recollection altogether; or that his declaration had been solely directed to other persons; but as it does contain observations respecting Mr. Lawrence, but nothing of a locked door, or the whispering within it; how he happened at that time not to recollect, or if he recollected not to mention, so very striking and remarkable a circumstance, is not, I should imagine, very satisfactorily to be explained. His statement in that first declaration stands thus, "In 1801, Lawrence "the painter was at Montague House, for four or five days at a "time, painting the Princess's picture. That he was frequently "alone late in the night with the Princess, and much suspicion "was entertained of him." Mr. Cole's next declaration, at least the next which appears among the written declarations, was taken on the 14th of January; it does not mention Mr. Lawrence's name, but it has this passage: "When Mr. Cole found the drawing-room, which led to the staircase to the Princess's apartments, locked (which your Majesty knows is the same which the witnesses call the Blue Room) he does not know whether any person was with her; but it appeared odd to him, as he had formed some suspicions." The striking and important observation on this passage is, that when he first talks of the door of the drawing-room being locked, so far from his mentioning any thing of *whispering being overheard*, he expressly says, that he did not

know that any body was with me. The passage is likewise deserving your Majesty's most serious consideration on another ground; for it is one of those which shews that Mr. Cole, though we have four separate declarations made by him, has certainly made other statements which have not been transmitted to your Majesty; for it evidently refers to something, which he had said before, of having found the drawing room door locked, and no trace of such a statement, is discoverable in the previous examination of Mr. Cole, as I have received it, and I have no doubt that, in obedience to your Majesty's commands, I have at length been furnished with the whole. I don't know, indeed, that it should be matter of complaint from me, that your Majesty has not been furnished with all the statements of Mr. Cole, because from the sample I see of them, I cannot suppose that any of them could have furnished any thing favourable to me, except indeed that they might have furnished me with fresh means of contradicting him by himself.

But your Majesty will see that there have been other statements not communicated; a circumstance of which both your Majesty and I have reason to complain. But it may be out of its place further to notice that fact at present.

To return, therefore, to Mr. Cole; in his third declaration, dated the 30th of January, there is not a word about Mr. Lawrence. In his fourth and last, which is dated on the 23d of February, he says "the person who was alone with the lady at "late hours of the night (twelve and one o'clock,) and whom he "left sitting up after he went to bed, was Mr. Lawrence, which "happened two different nights." Here is likewise another trace of a former statement which is not given; for no such person is mentioned before in any that I have been furnished with.

Your Majesty then here observes that, after having given evidence in two of his declarations, respecting Mr. Lawrence by name, in which he mentions nothing of locked doors, and after having, in another declaration, given an account of a locked door, but expressly stated that he knew not whether any one was with me within it, and said nothing about whispering being overheard, but, impliedly, at least, negatived it;—in the deposition before the Commissioners, he puts all these things together, and has the hardihood to add to them that remarkable circumstance, which

could not have escaped his recollection, at the first, if it had been true, " of his having on the same night in which he found me and " Mr. Lawrence alone, after the ladies were gone to bed, come " again to the room, when he thought Mr. Lawrence must have " been retired, and found the door locked and heard the whisper- " ing;" and then again he gives another instance of his honesty, and upon the same principle on which he took no notice of the man in the great coat, he finds the door locked, hears the whispering, and then he silently and contentedly retires.

And this witness, who thus not only varies in his testimony, but contradicts himself in such important particulars, is one of those who cannot be suspected of unfavourable bias, and whose veracity is not to be questioned, and whose evidence must be credited till decidedly contradicted.

These observations might probably be deemed sufficient, upon Mr. Cole's deposition, as far as it respects Mr. Lawrence; but I cannot be satisfied without explaining to your Majesty, all the truth, and the particulars, respecting Mr. Lawrence, which I recollect.

What I recollect then is as follows. He began a large picture of me, and of my daughter, towards the latter end of the year 1800, or the beginning of 1801. Miss Garth and Miss Hayman were in the house with me at the time. The picture was painted at Montague House. Mr. Lawrence mentioned to Miss Hayman his wish to be permitted to remain some few nights in the house, that by rising early he might begin painting on the picture, before Princess Charlotte (whose residence being at that time at Shooter's Hill, was enabled to come early,) or myself, came to sit. It was a similar request to that which had been made by Sir William Beechy, when he painted my picture. And I was sensible of no impropriety when I granted the request to either of them. Mr. Lawrence occupied the same room which had been occupied by Sir William Beechy:—it was at the other end of the house from my apartment.

At that time Mr. Lawrence did not dine with me; his dinner was served in his own room.—After dinner he came down to the room where I and my Ladies generally sat in an evening—sometimes there was music, in which he joined, and sometimes he read poetry. Parts of Shakespeare's Plays, I particularly remember,

from his reading them very well; and sometimes he played chess with me. It frequently may have happened that it was one or two o'clock before I dismissed Mr. Lawrence and my Ladies. They together with Mr. Lawrence, went out of the same door, up the same stair-case, and at the same time. According to my own recollection I should have said that in no one instance, they had left Mr. Lawrence behind them, alone with me.—But I suppose it did happen once for a short time, since Mr. Lawrence so recollects it, as your Majesty will perceive from his deposition, which I annex. He staid in my house two or three nights together; but how many nights in the whole, I do not recollect. The picture left my house by April, 1801, and Mr. Lawrence never slept in my house afterwards. That picture now belongs to Lady Townshend. He has since completed another picture of me; and about a year and a half ago, he began another, which remains at present unfinished. I believe it is near a twelve month since I last sat to him.

Mr. Lawrence lives upon a footing of the greatest intimacy with the neighbouring families of Mr. Lock and Mr. Angerstein: and I have asked him sometimes to dine with me to meet them. While I was sitting to him at my own house, I have no doubt I must often have sat to him alone; as the necessity for the precaution of having an attendant as a witness to protect my honour from suspicion, certainly never occurred to me. And upon the same principle, I do not doubt that I may have sometimes continued in conversation with him after he had finished painting. But when sitting in his own house, I have always been attended with one of my ladies.—And indeed nothing in the examinations state the contrary. One part of Mrs. Lisle's examination seems as if she had a question put to her, upon the supposition that I had been left alone with Mr. Lawrence at his own house; to which she answers, that she indeed had left me there, but that she *thinks* she left Mrs. Fitzgerald with me.

If an inference of an unfavourable nature could have been drawn from my having been left there alone;—was it, Sire, taking all that care which might be wished, to guard against such an inference on the part of the Commissioners, when they omitted to send for Mrs. Fitzgerald to ascertain what Mrs. Lisle may have left in doubt. The Commissioners, I give them the

fullest credit, were satisfied, that Mrs. Lisle thought correctly upon this fact, and that Mrs. Fitzgerald, if she had been sent for again, would so have proved it, and therefore that it would have been troubling her to no purpose. But this it is, of which I conceive myself to have most reason to complain; that the examinations in several instances have not been followed up so as to remove unfavourable impressions.

I cannot but feel satisfied that the Commissioners would have been glad to have been warranted in negativing all criminality, and all suspicion on this part of the charge, as completely and honourably as they have done on the principal charges of pregnancy and delivery. They traced that part of the charge with ability, sagacity, diligence, and perseverance; and the result was complete satisfaction of my innocence; complete detection of the falsehood of my accusers. Encouraged by their success in that part of their Inquiry, I lament that they did not, (as they thought proper to enter into the other part of it at all,) with similar industry pursue it. If they had, I am confident they would have pursued it with the same success; but though they had convicted Sir John and Lady Douglas of falsehood, they seem to have thought it *impossible to suspect* of the same falsehood, any other of the witnesses, though produced by Sir John and Lady Douglas. The most obvious means therefore of trying their credit, by comparing their evidence with what they had said before, seems to me to have been omitted. Many facts are left upon surmise only and insinuation; obvious means of getting further information on doubtful and suspicious circumstances are not resorted to; and, as if the important matter of the inquiry (on which a satisfactory conclusion had been formed) was all that required any very attentive or accurate consideration; the remainder of it was pursued in a manner which, as it seems to me, can only be accounted for by the pressure of what may have been deemed more important duties—and of this I should have made but little complaint, if this inquiry, where it is imperfect, had not been followed by a Report, which the most accurate only could have justified, and which such an accurate inquiry, I am confident, never could have produced.

If any credit was given to Mr. Cole's story of the locked door, and the whispering; and to Mr. Lawrence having been left with

me so frequently of a night when my Ladies had left us; why were not all my Ladies examined? why were not all my servants examined as to their knowledge of that fact? And if they had been so examined, and had contradicted the fact so sworn to by Mr. Cole, as they must have done, had they been examined to it; that alone would have been sufficient to have removed his name from the list of unsuspected and unquestionable witnesses, and relieved me from much of the suspicion, which his evidence, till it was examined, was calculated to have raised in your Majesty's mind.—And to close this statement, and these observations, and in addition to them,—I most solemnly assert to your Majesty, that Mr. Lawrence, neither at his own house, nor at mine, nor any where else, ever was for one moment, by night or by day, in the same room with me when the door of it was locked; that he never was in my company of an evening alone, except the momentary conversation which Mr. Lawrence speaks to, may be thought an exception; and that nothing ever passed between him and me which all the world might not have witnessed. And, Sire, I have subjoined a deposition to the same effect from Mr. Lawrence.

To satisfy myself, therefore, and your Majesty, I have shewn, I trust, by unanswerable observations and arguments, that there is no colour for crediting Mr. Cole, or, consequently, any part of this charge, which rests solely on his evidence. But to satisfy the requisition of the Commissioners, I have brought my pride to submit, (though not without great pain, I can assure your Majesty) to add the only contradictions which I conceive can be given, those of Mr. Lawrence and myself.

The next person with whom these examinations charge my improper familiarity, and with regard to which the Report represents the evidence as particularly strong, is Captain Manby. With respect to him, Mr. Cole's examination is silent.—But the evidence, on which the Commissioners rely on this part of the case, is Mr. Bidgood's, Miss Fanny Lloyd's, and Mrs. Lisle's.—It respects my conduct at three different places; at Montague House, Southend, and at Ramsgate. I shall preserve the facts, and my observations more distinct, if I consider the evidence, as applicable to these three places, separately, and in its order; and I prefer this mode of treating it, as it will enable me to consider

the evidence of Mrs. Lisle in the first place, and consequently put it out of the reach of the harsher observations, which I may be under the necessity of making, upon the testimony of the other two. For though Mrs. Lisle, indeed, speaks to having seen Captain Manby at East Cliff, in August, 1803, to the best of her rememberance it was only once. She speaks to his meeting her at Deal, in the same season; that he landed there with some boys whom I took on charity, and who were under his care; yet she speaks of nothing there that can require a single observation from me.—The material parts of her evidence respecting her seeing him at Blackheath, the Christmas before she had seen him at East Cliff. She says, it was the Christmas after Mr. Austin's child came, consequently the Christmas 1802-3.—He used to come to dine there, she says—he always went away in her presence, and she had no reason to think he staid after the Ladies retired. He lodged on the Heath at that time; his ship was fitting up at Deptford; he came to dinner three or four times a week or more.—She supposes he might be alone with the Princess, but that she was in the habit of seeing Gentlemen and Tradesmen without her being present. She (Mrs. Lisle) had seen him at luncheon and dinner both. The boys (two boys) came with him two or three times, but not to dinner. Captain Manby always sat next the Princess at dinner. The constant company were Mrs. and Miss Fitzgerald, and herself—all retired with the Princess, and sat in the same room. Captain Manby generally retired about eleven; and sat with us all till then. Captain Manby and the Princess used, when we were together to be speaking together separately, conversing separately, but not in a room alone. He was a person with whom the Princess appeared to have greater pleasure in talking than with her Ladies. Her Royal Highness behaved to him ONLY *as any woman would who likes flirting. She (Mrs. Lisle) would not have thought any married woman would have behaved properly, who behaved as Her Royal Highness did to Captain Manby. She cannot say whether the Princess was attached to Captain Manby, only that it was a flirting conduct.* She never saw any gallantries, as kissing her hand, or the like.

I have cautiously stated the whole of Mrs. Lisle's evidence upon this part of the case; and I am sure your Majesty in read-

ing it, will not fail to keep the facts, which Mrs. Lisle speaks to, separate from the opinion, or judgment, which she forms upon them. I mean not to speak disrespectfully or slightingly, of Mrs. Lisle's opinion; or express myself as in any degree indifferent to it. But whatever there was, which she observed in my conduct, that did not become a married woman, that "was ONLY like a woman who liked flirting," and "ONLY a flirting conduct," I am convinced your Majesty must be satisfied that it must have been far distant from affording any evidence of crime, of vice, or of indecency, as it passed openly in the company of my Ladies, of whom Mrs. Lisle herself was one.

The facts she states are, that Captain Manby came very frequently to my house; that he dined three or four times a week in the latter end of the year 1802; that he sat next to me at dinner; and that my conversation after dinner, in the evening, used to be with Captain Manby, separate from my Ladies. These are the facts: and is it upon them that my character, I will not say, is to be taken away, but is to be *affected?*

Captain Manby had, in the autumn of the same year, been introduced to me by Lady Townshend, when I was upon a visit to her at Rainham. I think he came there only the day before I left it. He was a naval officer, as I understood, and as I still believe, of great merit. What little expence, in the way of charity, I am able to afford, I am best pleased to dedicate to the education of the children of poor, but honest persons; and I most generally bring them up to the service of the Navy. I had at that time two boys at school, whom I thought of an age fit to be put to sea. I desired Lady Townshend to prevail upon Captain Manby to take them. He consented to it, and of course I was obliged to him.

About this time, or shortly afterwards, he was appointed to the Africaine, a ship which was fitting up at Deptford. To be near his ship, as I understood and believe, he took lodgings at Blackheath; and as to the mere fact of his being so frequently at my house,—his intimacy and friendship with Lord and Lady Townshend, which of itself was assurance to me of his respectability and character—my pleasure in shewing my respect to them, by notice and attention to a friend of theirs,—his undertaking the care of my charity boys,—and his accidental residence at

Blackheath, will, I should trust, not unreasonably account for it. I have a similar account likewise to give of paying for the linen furniture, with which his cabin was furnished. Wishing to make him some return for his trouble with the boys, I desired that I might choose the pattern of his furniture. I not only chose it, but had it sent to him, and paid the bill; finding, however, that it did not come to more than about twenty pounds, I thought it a shabby present, and therefore added some trifling present of plate. So I have frequently done, and I hope without offence, may be permitted to do again to any Captain, on whom I impose such trouble. Sir Samuel Hood has now two of my charity boys with him; and I have presented him with a silver Epergne. I should be ashamed to notice such things, but your Majesty perceives that they are made the subject of Inquiry from Mrs. Fitzgerald, and Mr. Stikeman, and I was desirous that they should not appear to be particular in the case of Captain Manby.

But to return to Mrs. Lisle's examination. Mrs. Lisle says that Captain Manby, when he dined with me, sat next to me at dinner. Before any inference is drawn from that fact, I am sure your Majesty will observe that, in the next line of Mrs. Lisle's examination, she says, "that the constant company was Mrs. "and Miss Fitzgerald, and herself, Mrs. Lisle." The only gentleman, the only person of the whole party who was not of my own family, was Captain Manby, and his sitting next to me, under such circumstances, I should apprehend could not possibly afford any inference of any kind. In the evening we were never alone. The whole company sat together; nay, even as to his being with me alone of a morning, Mrs. Lisle seems to know nothing of the fact, but from a conjecture founded upon her knowledge of my known usual habit, with respect of seeing gentlemen who might call upon me. And the very foundation of her conjecture demonstrates that this circumstance can be no evidence of any thing particular with regard to Captain Manby.

As to my conversing with Captain Manby separately, I do not understand Mrs. Lisle as meaning to speak to the state of the conversation uninterruptedly, during the whole of any of the several evenings when Captain Manby was with me; if I did so understand her, I should certainly most confidently assert, that she was not correct. That in the course of the evening, as the

ladies were working, reading, or otherwise amusing themselves, the conversation was sometimes more, and sometimes less general; and that they sometimes took more, sometimes less part in it;—that frequently it was between Captain Manby and myself alone; and that, when we were altogether, we two might frequently be the only persons not otherwise engaged, and therefore be justly said, to be speaking together separately. Besides Captain Manby has been round the world with Captain Vancovre. I have looked over prints in books of voyages with him; he has explained them to me; the ladies may or may not have been looking over them at the same time; they may have been engaged with their own amusements. Here again, we may be said to have been conversing separately, and consequently that Mrs. Lisle, in this sense, is perfectly justified in saying that "I used to "converse separately with Captain Manby," I have not the least difficulty in admitting. But have I not again reason to complain that this expression of Mrs. Lisle's was not more sifted, but left in a manner calculated to raise an impression that this separate conversation was studiously sought for, was constant, uniform, and uninterrupted, though it by no means asserts any such thing? But whether I used *always* so to converse with him; or *generally*, or only *sometimes*, or for what proportion of the evening I used to be so engaged, is left unasked and unexplained. Have I not likewise just reason to complain, that though Mrs. Lisle states that Mrs. Fitzgerald and Miss Fitzgerald were always of the party, they are not both examined as to these circumstances? But Miss Fitzgerald is not examined at all; and Mrs. Fitzgerald, though examined, and examined too with respect to Captain Manby, does not appear to have had a single question put to her with respect to any thing which passed concerning him at Montague House. May I not therefore complain that the examination, leaving the generality of Mrs. Lisle's expression unexplained by herself; and the scenes to which it relates unexamined into, by calling the other persons who were present, is leaving it precisely in that state, which is better calculated to raise a suspicion, than to ascertain the truth.

But I am persuaded that the unfavourable impression which is most likely to be made by Mrs. Lisle's examination, is not by her evidence to the facts, but by her opinion upon them. "I

" appeared," she says, " to like the conversation of Captain " Manby better than that of my ladies. I behaved to him *only* " as a woman who likes flirting, my conduct was unbecoming a " married woman; she cannot say whether I was attached to " Captain Manby or not; it was *only* a flirting conduct."—Now, Sire, I must here again most seriously complain that the Commissioners should have called for, or received, and much more reported, in this manner, the *opinion* and *judgment* of Mrs. Lisle upon my conduct. Your Majesty's Warrant purports to authorise them to collect the evidence, and not the opinion of others; and to report it, with their own judgment surely, and not Mrs. Lisle's. Mrs. Lisle's judgment was formed upon those facts which she stated to the Commissioners, or upon other facts. If upon those she stated, the Commissioners, and your Majesty, are as well able to form the judgment upon them as she was. If upon other facts, the Commissioners should have heard what those other facts were, and upon them have formed and reported their judgment.

I am aware, indeed, that if I were to argue that the facts which Mrs. Lisle states, afford the explanation of what she means by, " only flirting conduct," and by " behaviour unbecoming a married woman," namely, that it consisted in having the same gentleman to dine with me three or four times a week;—letting him sit next me at dinner, when there were no other strangers in company;—conversing with him separately, and appearing to prefer his conversation to that of the ladies,—it would be observed, probably, that this was not all; that there was always a certain indiscribable something in *manner*, which gave the character to conduct, and must have entered mainly into such a judgment as Mrs. Lisle has here pronounced.

To a certain extent I should be obliged to agree to this; but, if I am to have any prejudice from this observation; if it is to give a weight and authority to Mrs. Lisle's judgment, let me have the advantage of it also. If it justifies the conclusion that Mrs. Lisle's censure upon my conduct is right, it requires also that equal credit should be given to the qualification, the limit, and the restriction, which she herself puts upon that censure.

Mrs. Lisle, seeing all the facts which she relates, and ob-

serving much of manner, which perhaps she could not describe, limits the expression, "flirting conduct," by calling it "only flirting," and says (upon having the question asked to her, no doubt, whether from the whole she could collect that I was attached to Captain Manby,) says "she could not say whether I was attached to him, my conduct was not of a nature that proved any attachment to him, it was only a flirting conduct." Unjust, therefore, as I think it, that any such question should have been put to Mrs. Lisle, or that her judgment should have been taken at all; yet, what I fear from it, as pressing with peculiar hardship upon me, is, that though it is Mrs. Lisle's final and ultimate judgment upon the whole of my conduct, yet, when delivered to the Commissioners and your Majesty, it becomes evidence, which, connected with all the facts on which Mrs. Lisle had formed it, may lead to still further and more unfavourable conclusions, in the minds of those who are afterwards to judge upon it;—that her judgment will be the foundation of other judgments against me, much severer than her own; and that, though she evidently limits her opinion, and by saying, "ONLY flirting," impliedly negatives it as affording any indication of any thing more improper, while she proceeds *expressly* to negative it as affording any proof of attachment; yet, it may be thought by others, to justify their considering it as a species of conduct, which shewed an attachment to the man to whom it was addressed; which in a married woman was criminal and wrong.

What Mrs. Lisle exactly means by *only flirting* conduct—what degree of impropriety of conduct she would describe by it, it is extremely difficult, with any precision, to ascertain. How many women are there, most virtuous, most truly modest, incapable of any thing impure, vicious, or immoral, in deed or thought; who, from the greater vivacity of spirits, from less natural reserve, from that want of caution, which the very consciousness of innocence betrays them into, conduct themselves in a manner, which a woman of a graver character, of more reserved disposition, but not with one particle of superior virtue, thinks too incautious, too unreserved, too familiar; and which, if forced upon her oath to give her opinion of it, she might feel herself, as an honest woman, bound to say in that opinion, was flirting?

But, whatever sense Mrs. Lisle annexes to the word "flirting," it is evident, as I said before, that she cannot mean any thing criminal, vicious, or indecent, or any thing with the least shade of deeper impropriety than what is necessarily expressed in the word "flirting." She never would have added, as she does in both instances, that it was ONLY flirting; if she had thought it of a quality to be recorded in a formal Report, amongst circumstances which *must* occasion the *most* unfavourable interpretations, and which, deserved the most serious consideration of your Majesty. To use it so, I am sure your Majesty must see is to press it far beyond the meaning which she would assign to it herself.

And, as I have admitted that there may be much indescribable in the manner of doing any thing, so it must be admitted to me that there is much indescribable, and most material also in the manner of saying any thing, and in the accent with which it is said. The whole context serves much to explain it; and, if it is in answer to a question, the words of that question, the manner and the accent in which it is asked, are also most material to understand the precise meaning, which the expressions are intended to convey; and, I must lament therefore extremely, if my character is to be affected by the opinion of any witness, that the question by which that opinion was drawn from her, were not given too, as well as her answers, and if this inquiry had been prosecuted before your Majesty's Privy Council, the more solemn and usual course of proceeding there would, as I am informed, have furnished, or enabled me to furnish, your Majesty with the questions as well as the answers.

Mrs. Lisle, it should also be observed, was, at the time of her examination, under the severe oppression of having, but a few days before, heard of the death of her daughter;—a daughter, who had been happily married, and who had lived happily with her husband, in mutual attachment, till her death. The very circumstance of her then situation would naturally give a graver and severer cast to her opinions. When the question was proposed to her, as a general question, (and I presume it must have been so put to her) whether my conduct was such as would become a married woman, possibly her own daughter's conduct, and what she would have expected of her, might present itself to

her mind. And, I confidently submit to your Majesty's better judgment, that such a general question ought not, in a fair and candid consideration of my case, to have been put to Mrs. Lisle, or any other woman. For, as to my conduct being, or not being, becoming a married woman; the same conduct, or any thing like it, which may occur in my case, could not occur in the case of a married woman, who was not living in my unfortunate situation; or, if it did occur, must occur under circumstances which must give it, and most deservedly, a very different character. A married woman, living well and happily with her husband, could not be frequently having one gentleman at her table, with no other company but ladies of her family;—she could not be spending her evenings frequently in the same society, and separately conversing with that gentleman, unless either with the privity and consent of her husband, or by taking advantage, with some management, of his ignorance and his absence; if it was with his privity and consent, that very circumstance alone would unquestionably alter the character of such conduct,—if with management she avoided his knowledge, that very management would betray a bad motive. The cases therefore are not parallel;—the illustration is not just;—and the question, which called for such an answer from Mrs. Lisle, ought not, in candor and fairness, to have been put.

I entreat your Majesty, however, not to misunderstand me;—I should be ashamed indeed to be suspected of pleading any peculiar or unfortunate circumstance, in my situation, as an excuse for any criminal or indecent act. With respect to such acts, most unquestionably such circumstances can make no difference;—and afford no excuse. They must bear their own character of disgrace and infamy, under all circumstances. But there are acts, which are unbecoming a married woman, which ought to be avoided by her, from an apprehension lest they should render her husband uneasy, not because they might give him any reason to distrust her chastity, her virtue, or her morals, but because they might wound his feelings by indicating a preference to the society of another man, over his, in a case, where she had the option of both. But, surely, as to such acts, they must necessarily bear a very different character, and receive a very different construction, in a case, where, unhappily, there can

be no such apprehension, and where there is no such option. I must, therefore, be excused for dwelling so much upon this part of the case; and I am sure, your Majesty will feel me warranted in saying, what I say with a confidence, exactly proportioned to the respectability of Mrs. Lisle's character, that, whatever she meant, by any of these expressions, she could not, by possibility, have meant to describe conduct, which to her mind afforded evidence of crime, vice, or indecency. If she had, her regard to her own character, her own delicacy, her own honourable and virtuous feelings, would in less than the two years, which have since elapsed, have found some excuse for separating herself from that intimate connexion, which by her situation in my household, subsists between us. She would not have remained exposed to the repetition of so gross an offence and insult, to a modest, virtuous, and delicate woman, as that of being made, night by night, witness to scenes, openly acted in her presence, offensive to virtue and decorum.

If your Majesty thinks I have dwelt too long, and tediously, on this part of the case, I entreat your Majesty to think what I must feel upon it. I feel it a great hardship, as I have frequently stated, that under the cover of a grave charge of High Treason, the proprieties, and decencies of my private conduct and behaviour, have been made the subject, as I believe so unprecedentedly, of a formal investigation upon oath. And that in consequence of it, I may, at this moment, be exposed to the danger of forfeiting your Majesty's good opinion, and being degraded and disgraced, in reputation, through the country, because what Mrs. Lisle has said of my conduct,—that it was "only that of a woman who liked flirting," has become recorded in the Report on this formal enquiry, made into matters of grave crimes, and of essential importance to the State.

Let me conjure your Majesty, over and over again, before you suffer this circumstance to prejudice me in your opinion, not only to weigh all the circumstances I have stated, but to look round the first ranks of female virtue, in this country, and see how many women there are of most unimpeachable reputation, of most unsullied and unsuspected honour, character, and virtue, whose conduct, though living happily with their husbands, if submitted to the judgment of persons of a severer cast of mind,

especially if saddened at the moment by calamity, might be styled to be "flirting." I would not, however, be understood as intending to represent Mrs. Lisle's judgment, as being likely to be marked with any improper austerity, and therefore I am certain she must either have had no idea that the expressions she had used, in the manner which she used them, were capable of being understood in so serious a light as to be referred to, amongst circumstances deserving the most serious consideration, and which must occasion unfavourable interpretations; or she must by the imposing novelty of her situation, in private examination before four such grave characters, have been surprised into the use of expressions, which, with a better opportunity of weighing them, she would either not have used at all, or have accompanied with still more of qualification than that, which she has, however, in some degree, as it is, annexed to them.

But my great complaint is the having, not, particularly, Mrs. Lisle's opinion, but any person's opinion, set up, as it were, in judgment against the propriety of my private conduct. How would it be endured, that the judgment of one man should be asked, and recorded in a solemn Report, against the conduct of another, either with respect to his behaviour to his children, or to his wife, or to any other relative? How would it be endured, in general, and I trust, that my case ought not, in this respect, to form an exception, that one woman should in a similar manner be placed in judgment, upon the conduct of another? And that judgment be reported, where her character was of the most importance to her, as amongst things which must be credited till decidedly contradicted? Let every one put these questions home to their own breasts, and before they impute blame to me, for protesting against the fairness and justice of this procedure, ask how they would feel upon it, if it were their own case?

But perhaps they cannot bring their imaginations to conceive that it could ever become their own case. A few months ago I could not have believed that it would have been mine.

But the just ground of my complaint may perhaps be more easily appreciated and felt, by supposing a more familiar, but an analogous case. The High Treason, with which I was charged, was supposed to be committed in the foul crime of Adultery. What would be the impression of your Majesty, what would be

the impression upon the mind of any one, acquainted with the excellent laws of your Majesty's kingdom, and the admirable administration of them, if upon a commission of this kind, secretly to inquire into the conduct of any man, upon a charge of High Treason, against the state, the Commissioners should not only proceed to inquire, whether in the judgment of the witness, the conduct of the accused was such as became a loyal subject; but, when the result of their Inquiry obliged them to report directly against the charge of Treason, they, nevertheless, should record an imputation, or libel, against his character for loyalty, and reporting, as part of the evidence, the opinion of the witness, that the conduct of the accused was such as did not become a loyal subject, should further report, that the evidence of that witness, without specifying any part of it, must be credited till decidedly contradicted, and deserved the most serious consideration? How could he appeal from that Report? How could he decidedly contradict the opinion of the witness? Sire, there is no difference between this supposed case and mine, but this: That in the case of the man, a character for loyalty, however injured, could not be destroyed by such an insinuation. His future life might give him abundant opportunities of falsifying the justice of it. But a female character, once so blasted, what hope or chance has it of recovery?

Your Majesty will not fail to perceive, that I have pressed this part of the case, with an earnestness which shews that I have felt it. I have no wish to disguise from your Majesty, that I have felt it, and felt it strongly. It is the only part of the case, which I conceive to be in the least degree against me, that rests upon a witness who is at all worthy of your Majesty's credit. How unfair it is, that any thing she has said should be pressed against me, I trust I have sufficiently shewn.* In canvassing, however, Mrs. Lisle's evidence, I hope I have never forgot what was due to Mrs. Lisle. I have been as anxious not to do her injustice, as to do justice to myself. I retain the same respect and regard for Mrs. Lisle now, as I ever had. If the unfavourable impressions, which the Commissioners seem to suppose, fairly arise out of the expressions she has used, I am confident they will be understood, in a sense, which was never intended by her. And I should scorn to purchase any advantage to myself,

at the expence of the slightest imputation, unjustly cast upon Mrs. Lisle, or any one else.

Leaving therefore, with these observations, Mrs. Lisle's evidence, I must proceed to the evidence of Mr. Bidgood. The parts of it which apply to this part of the case, I mean my conduct to Captain Manby, at Montague House, I shall detail. They are as follow: "I first observed Captain Manby came to Montague House either the end of 1803, or the beginning of 1804. I was waiting one day in the anti-room; Captain Manby had his hat in his hand, and appeared to be going away; he was a long time with the Princess, and, as I stood on the steps waiting, I looked into the room in which they were, and in the reflection on the looking-glass I saw them salute each other. I mean that they kissed each other's lips. Captain Manby then went away. I then observed the Princess have her handkerchief in her hands, and wipe her eyes, as if she was crying, and went into the drawing-room." In his second deposition, on the 3rd of July, talking of his suspicions of what passed at Southend, he says, "they arose from seeing them kiss each other, as I mentioned before, like people fond of each other;—a very close kiss."

In these extracts from his depositions, there can undoubtedly be no complaint of any thing being left to inference. Here is a fact, which must unquestionably occasion almost as unfavourable interpretations, as any fact of the greatest impropriety and indecorum, short of the proof of actual crime. And this fact is positively and affirmatively sworn to. And if this witness is truly represented, as one who must be credited till he is decidedly contradicted; and the decided contradiction of the parties accused, should be considered as unavailing, it constitutes a charge which cannot possibly be answered. For the scene is so laid, that there is no eye to witness it, but his own: and therefore there can be no one who can possibly contradict him, however false his story may be, but the persons whom he accused. As for me, Sire, there is no mode, the most solemn that can be devised, in which I shall not be anxious and happy to contradict it. And I do here most solemnly, in the face of Heaven, most directly and positively affirm, that it is as foul, malicious, and wicked a falsehood, as ever was invented by the malice of man. Captain Manby, to whom I have been under the necessity of

applying, for that purpose, in the deposition which I annex, most expressly and positively denies it also. Beyond these our two denials, there is nothing which can by possibility be *directly* opposed to Mr. Bidgood's evidence.—All that remains to be done is to examine Mr. Bidgood's credit, and to see how far he deserves the character which the Commissioners give to him.—How unfoundedly they gave such a character to Mr. Cole, your Majesty, I am satisfied, must be fully convinced.

I suppose there must be some mistake, I will not call it by any harsher name, for I think it can be no more than a mistake, in Mr. Bidgood's saying, that the first time he knew Captain Manby come to Montague House, was at the end of 1803, or beginning of 1804, for he first came at the end of the former year; and the fact is, that Mr. Bidgood must have seen him then.—But, however, the date is comparatively immaterial, the fact it is, that is important.

And here, Sire, surely I have the same complaint which I have so often urged. I would ask your Majesty, whether I, not as a Princess of Wales, but as a party accused, had not a right to be thought, and to be presumed, innocent, till I was proved to be guilty? Let me ask, if there ever could exist a case, in which the credit of the witness ought to have been more severely sifted and tried? The fact rested solely upon his single assertion. However false, it could not possibly receive contradiction, but from the parties. The story itself surely is not very probable. My character cannot be considered as under inquiry; it is already gone, and decided upon, by those, if there are any such, who think such a story probable.—That in a room, with the door open, and a servant known to be waiting just by, we should have acted such a scene of gross indecency. The indiscretion at least might have rendered it improbable, even to those, whose prejudices against me, might be prepared to conceive nothing improbable in the indecency of it. Yet this seems to have been received as a fact that there was no reason to question. The witness is assumed, without hesitation, to be the witness of truth, of unquestionable veracity. Not the faintest trace is there to be found of a single question put to him, to try and sift the credit which was due to him, or to his story.

Is he asked, as I suggested before should have been done with

regard to Mr. Cole—To whom he told this fact before? When he told it, what was ever done in consequence of this information? If he never told it, till for the purpose of supporting Lady Douglas's statement, how could he in his situation, as an old servant of the Prince, with whom as he swears, he had lived twenty-three years, creditably to himself, account for having concealed it so long? And how came Lady Douglas and Sir John to find out that he knew it, if he never had communicated it before? If he had communicated it, it would then have been useful to have heard how far his present story was consistent with his former; and if it should have happened that this and other matters, which he may have stated, were, at that time, made the subject of any inquiry; then how far that inquiry had tended to confirm or shake his credit. His first examination was, it is true, taken by Lord Grenville, and Lord Spencer alone, without the aid of the experience of the Lord Chancellor, and Lord Chief Justice; this undoubtedly may *account* for the omission; but the noble Lords will forgive me if I say, it does not *excuse* it, especially as Mr. Bidgood was examined again on the 3rd of July, by all the Commissioners, and this fact is again referred to them, as the foundation of the suspicion which he afterwards entertained of Captain Manby at Southend. Nay, that last deposition affords on my part, another ground of similar complaint of the strongest kind. It opens thus: "The Princess used to go out "in her phæton with coachman and helper, towards Long Reach, "eight or ten times, carrying luncheon and wine with her, when "Captain Manby's ship was at Long Reach, *always Mrs. Fitz-*"*gerald with her.*—She would go out at one, and return about "five or six, sometimes sooner or later."

The date when Captain Manby's ship was lying at Long Reach, is not given; and therefore whether this was before, or after, the scene of the supposed salute, does not appear. But for what was this statement of Mr. Bidgood's made? Why was it introduced? Why were these drives towards Long Reach with luncheon, connected with Captain Manby's ship lying there at the time, examined to by the Commissioners? The first point, the matter foremost in their minds, when they call back this witness for his re-examination, appears to have been these drives towards Long Reach.—Can it have been for any purpose but to

have the benefit of the insinuation to leave it open to be inferred, that those drives were for the purpose of meeting Captain Manby? If this fact was material, why in the name of justice, was it so left? Mrs. Fitzgerald was mentioned by name, as accompanying me in them all: Why was not she called? She perhaps was my confidante; no truth could have been hoped for from her;—still there were my coachman and helper, who likewise accompanied me; Why were they not called? They are not surely confidantes too.—But it is, for what reason I cannot pretend to say, thought sufficient to leave this fact, or rather this insinuation, upon the evidence of Mr. Bidgood, who only saw, or could see the way I went when I set out upon my drive, instead of having the fact from the persons who could speak to the whole of it; to the places I went to; to the persons whom I met with.

Your Majesty will think me justified in dwelling upon this, the more from this circumstance, because I know, and will shew to your Majesty, on the testimony of Jonathan Partridge, which I annex, that these drives, or at least one of them, have been already the object of previous, and, I believe, nearly cotemporary investigation. The truth is, that it did happen upon two of these drives that I met with Captain Manby; IN ONE of them that he joined me, and went with me to Lord Eardley's, at Belvidere, and that he partook of something which we had to eat;—that some of Lord Eardley's servants were examined as to my conduct upon this occasion;—and am confidently informed that the servants gave a most satisfactory account of all that passed; nay, that they felt, and have expressed some honest indignation at the foul suspicion which the examination implied. On the other occasion, having the boys to go on board the Africaine, I went with one of my Ladies to see them on board, and Captain Manby joined us in our walk round Mr. Calcraft's grounds at Ingress Park, opposite to Long Reach; where we walked, while my horses were baiting. We went into no house, and on that occasion had nothing to eat.

Perfectly unable to account why these facts were not more fully inquired into, if thought proper to be inquired into at all, I return again to Mr. Bidgood's evidence. As far as it respects my conduct at Montague House, it is confined to the circum-

stances which I have already mentioned. And, upon those circumstances, I have no further observation, which may tend to illustrate Mr. Bidgood's credit to offer. But I trust if, from other parts of his evidence, your Majesty sees traces of the strongest prejudices against me, and the most scandalous inferences, drawn from circumstances, which can in no degree support them, your Majesty will then be able justly to appreciate the credit due to every part of Mr. Bidgood's evidence.

Under the other head, into which I have divided this part of the case, I mean my conduct at Southend, as relative to Captain Manby, Mr. Bidgood is more substantial and particular. His statement on this head begins by shewing that I was at Southend about six weeks before the Africaine, Captain Manby's ship, arrived. That Mr. Sicard was looking out for its arrival, as if she was expected. And as it is my practice to require as constant a correspondence to be kept up with my charity boys, when on board of ship, as the nature of their situation will admit of, and as Mr. Sicard is the person who manages all matters concerning them, and enters into their interests with the most friendly anxiety, he certainly was apprized of the probability of the ship's arrival off Southend, before she came. And here I may as well, perhaps, by the way, remark, that as this correspondence with the boys is always under cover to the Captain; this circumstance may account to your Majesty for the fact, which is stated by some of the witnesses, of several letters being put into the post by Sicard, some of which he may have received from me, which were directed to Captain Manby.

Soon after the arrival of the Africaine, however, Bidgood says, the Captain put off in his boat. Sicard went to meet him, and immediately brought him up to me and my Ladies:—he dined there then, and came frequently to see me. It would have been as candid, if Mr. Bidgood had represented the fact as it really was, though perhaps the circumstance is not very material:—that the Captain brought the two boys on shore with him to see me, and this as well as many other circumstances connected with these boys, the existence of whom, as accounting in any degree for the intercourse between me and Captain Manby, could never have been collected from out of Bidgood's depositions, Sicard would have stated, if the Commissioners had examined

him to it. But though he is thus referred to, though his name is mentioned about the letters sent to Captain Manby, he does not appear to have been examined to any of them, and all that he appears to have been asked is, as to his remembering Captain Manby visiting at Montague House, and to my paying the expence of the linen furniture for his cabin. But Mr. Sicard was, I suppose, represented by my enemies to be a confidante, from whom no truth could be extracted, and therefore, that it was idle waste of time to examine him to such points; and, so unquestionably, he, and every other honest servant in my family, who could be supposed to know any thing upon the subject, were sure to be represented by those, whose conspiracy and falsehood, their honesty and truth, were the best means of detecting. The conspirators, however, had the first word, and unfortunately their veracity was not questioned, nor their unfavourable bias suspected.

Mr. Bidgood then proceeds to state the situation of the houses, two of which, with a part of a third, I had at Southend. He describes No. 9, as the house in which I slept; No. 8, as that in which we dined; and No. 7, as containing a drawing-room, to which we retired after dinner. And, he says, "I have several "times seen the Princess, after having gone to No. 7, with Cap- "tain Manby and the rest of the company, retire with Captain "Manby from No, 7, through No. 8, to No. 9, which was the "house where the Princess slept. I *suspect* that Captain Manby "slept very frequently in the house.—Hints were given by the "servants, and I believe that others suspected it as well as "myself."—What those hints were, by what servants given, are things which do not seem to have been thought necessary matters of inquiry. At least, there is no trace in Mr. Bidgood's, or any other witness's examination, of any such inquiry having been made.

In his second deposition, which applies to the same fact, after saying that we went away the day after the Africaine sailed from Southend, he says, "Captain Manby was there three times a "week at the least, whilst his ship lay for six weeks off Southend "at the Nore;—he came as tide served in a morning, and to "dine, and drink tea. I have seen him *next* morning by ten "o'clock. I suspected he slept at No. 9, the Princess's. She

" always put out the candles herself in the drawing-room at " No. 9, and bid me not wait to put them up. She gave me the " orders as soon as she went to Southend. I used to see water " jugs, basins, and towels, set out opposite the Princess's door " in the passage. Never saw them so left in the passage at any " other time, and I suspected he was there at that time; there " was a general suspicion through the house. Mrs. and Miss " Fitzgerald there, and Miss Hammond (now Mrs. Hood) there. " My suspicion arose from seeing them in the glass," &c. as mentioned before.—" Her behaviour like that of a woman attached " to a man, used to be by themselves at luncheon, at Southend, " when the ladies were not sent for; a number of times. There " was a poney which Captain Manby used to ride; it stood in " the stable ready for him, and which Sicard used to ride." Then he says, the servants used to talk and laugh about Captain Manby, and that it was matter of discourse amongst them; and this, with what has been alluded to before, respecting Sicard's putting letters for him into the post, which he had received from me, contains the whole of his deposition as far as respects Captain Manby. And, Sire, as to the fact of retiring through No. 8, from No. 7, to No. 9, alone with Captain Manby, I have no recollection of ever having gone with Captain Manby, though but for a moment, from the one room in which the company was sitting, through the dining-room, to the other drawing-room. It is, however, now above two years ago, and to be confident that such a circumstance might not have happened, is more than I will undertake to be. But, in the only sense in which he uses the expression, as retiring alone, coupled with the immediate context that follows, it is most false and scandalous. I know no means of absolutely proving a negative. If the fact was true, there must have been other witnesses who could have proved it as well as Mr. Bidgood. Mrs. Fitzgerald is the only person of the party, who was examined, and her evidence proves the negative so far as the negative can be proved; for, she says, " he dined there, " but never staid late. She was at Southend all the time I was " there, and cannot recollect to have seen Captain Manby there, " or known him to be there, later than nine, or half-past nine." Miss Fitzgerald and Miss Hammond, (now Mrs. Hood) are not called to this fact; although a fact so extremely important, as

it must appear to your Majesty; nor, indeed, are they examined at all.

As to the putting out of the candles, it seems he says, I have the orders as soon as I went to Southend, which was six weeks before the Africaine arrived; so this plan of excluding him from the opportunity of knowing what was going on at No. 9, was part of a long meditated scheme, as he would represent it, planned and thought of six weeks before it could be executed; and which, when it was executed, your Majesty will recollect, according to Mr. Bidgood's evidence, there was so little contrivance to conceal, that the basins and the towels, which the Captain is insinuated to have used, were exposed to sight, as if to declare that he was there.——It is tedious and disgusting, Sire, I am well aware, to trouble your Majesty with such particulars; but, it doubtless, is true, that I bid him not to take the candles away from No. 9. The candles which are used in my drawing-room, are considered as his perquisite. Those on the contrary, which are used in my private apartment, are the perquisites of my maid. I thought that, upon the whole, it was a fairer arrangement, when I was at Southend, to give my maid the perquisites of the candles used at No. 9; and, I made the arrangement accordingly, and ordered Mr. Bidgood to leave them. This, Sire, is the true account of the fact respecting the candles; an arrangement which, very possibly, Mr. Bidgood did not like.

But, the putting out the candles myself, was not the only thing, from which the inference is drawn, that Captain Manby slept at my house, at No. 9, and, as is evidently insinuated, if not stated, in my bed-room. There were water-jugs, and basins, and towels, left in the passage, which Mr. Bidgood never saw at other times. At what other times does he mean? At other times than those at which he suspected, from seeing them there, that Captain Manby slept at my house? If every time he saw the basins, and towels, &c. in the passage, he suspected Captain Manby slept there, it certainly would follow, that he never saw them at times when he did not suspect that fact. But, Sire, upon this important fact,—important to the extent of convicting me, if it were true, of High Treason, if it were not for the indignation which such scandalous, licentious wickedness and malice

excite, it would hardly be possible to treat it with any gravity. Whether there were or were not basons and towels sometimes left in the passage at Southend, which were not there generally, and ought to have been never there, I really cannot inform your Majesty. It certainly is possible, but the utmost it can prove, I should trust, might be some slovenliness in my servant, who did not put them in their proper places; but, surely, it must be left to Mr. Bidgood alone to tracé any evidence, from such a circumstance, of the crime of adultery in me. But, I cannot thus leave this fact, for I trust, I shall here again have the same advantage from the excess and extravagance of this man's malice, as I have already had on the other part of the charge, from the excess and extravagance of his confederate, Lady Douglas.

What is the charge that he would insinuate? That I meditated and effected a stolen, secret, clandestine intercourse with an adulterer? No.—Captain Manby, it seems according to his insinuation, slept with me in my own house, under circumstances of such notoriety, that it was impossible that any of my female attendants, at least, should not have known it. Their duties were varied on the occasion: they had to supply basons and towels, in places where they never were supplied, except when prepared for him; and they were not only purposely so prepared, but prepared in an open passage, exposed to view, in a manner to excite the suspicion of those who were not admitted into the secret. And what a secret was it, that was thus to be hazarded! No less than what, if discovered, would fix Captain Manby and myself with High Treason! Not only therefore must I have been thus careless of reputation, and eager for infamy; but I must have been careless of my life, as of my honour.—Lost to all sense of shame, surely I must have still retained some regard for life. Captain Manby too with a folly and madness equal to his supposed iniquity, must then have put his life into the hands of my servants, and depended for his safety upon their fidelity to me, and their perfidy to the Prince their master. If the excess of vice and crime in all this is believed, could its indiscretion, its madness find credulity to adopt it almost upon an evidence? But what must be the state of that man's mind, as to prejudice, who could come to the conclusion of believing it, from the fact of some water-jugs and towels being found in an

unusual place, in a passage near my bed-room? For as to his suspicion being raised by what he says he saw in the looking-glass, if it was as true as it is false, that could not occasion his believing, on any particular night, that Captain Manby slept in my house: the situation of these towels and basins is what leads to that belief.

But, Sire, may I ask, did the Commissioners believe this man's suspicions? If they did, what do they mean by saying that these facts of great indecency, &c. went to a much less extent than the principal charges? And that it was not for them to state their bearing and effect? The bearing of this fact, unquestionably, if believed, is the same as that of the principal charge: namely, to prove me guilty of High Treason. They therefore could not believe it; but if they did not believe it, and as it seems to me, Sire, no men of common judgment could, on such a statement, how could they bring themselves to name Mr. Bidgood as one of those witnesses on whose unbiassed testimony they could so rely? or how could they in pointing him out with the other three, as speaking to facts, *particularly with respect to Captain Manby*, which must be credited till decidedly contradicted, omit to specify the facts which he spoke to, that they thus thought worthy of belief, but leave the whole, including this incredible part of it, recommended to belief by their general and unqualified sanction and approbation.

But the falsehood of this charge does not rest on its incredibility alone. My servant, Mrs. Sander, who attended constantly on my person, and whose bed room was close to mine, was examined by the Commissioners; she must have known this fact if it had been true; she positively swears, "that she did not know or believe, that Captain Manby staid till very late hours with me; that she never suspected there was any improper familiarity between us." M. Wilson, who made my bed, swears "that she had been in the habit of making it ever since she lived with me, that another maid, whose name was Ann Bye, assisted with her in making it, and swears from what she observed, that she never had any reason to believe that two persons had slept in it." Referring thus by name to her fellow servant, who made the bed with her, but that servant, why I know not, is not examined.

As your Majesty then finds the inference drawn by Bidgood to

amount to a fact so openly and undisguisedly profligate, as to outrage all credibility, as your Majesty finds it negatived by the evidence of three witnesses, one of whom, in particular, if such a fact were true, must have known it; as your Majesty finds one witness appealing to another, who is pointed out as a person who must have been able, with equal means of knowledge, to have confirmed her if she spoke true, and to have contradicted her if she spoke false. And Sire, when added to all this, your Majesty is graciously pleased to recollect that Mr. Bidgood was one of those who, though in my service, submitted themselves voluntarily to be examined previous to the appointment of the Commissioners, in confirmation of Lady Douglas's statement, without informing me of the fact; and when I state to your Majesty upon the evidence of Philip Krackeler, and Robert Eaglestone, whose deposition I annex, that this unbiassed witness, during the pendency of these examinations before the Commissioners, was seen to be in conference and communication with Lady Douglas, my most ostensible accuser, do I raise my expectations too high, when I confidently trust that his malice and his falsehood, as well as his connection in this conspiracy against my honour, my station in this kingdom, and my life, will appear to your Majesty too plainly for him to receive any credit, either in this or any other part of his testimony?

The other circumstances, to which he speaks, are comparatively too trifling, for me to trouble your Majesty with any more observations upon his evidence.

The remaining part of the case, which respects Captain Manby, relates to my conduct at East Cliff.

How little Mrs. Lisle's examination affords for observations upon this part of the case, except as shewing how very seldom Captain Manby called upon me while I was there, I have already observed. Mr. Cole says nothing upon this part of the case; nor Mr. Bidgood. The only witness amongst the four whose testimonies are distinguished by the Commissioners as most material, and as those on which they particularly rely, who says any thing upon this part of the case, is Fanny Lloyd. Her deposition is as follows:

"I was at Ramsgate with the Princess in 1803. One morning when we were in the house at East Cliff, somebody, I don't recol-

ect who, knocked at my door, and desired me to prepare breakfast for the Princess. This was about six o'clock; I was asleep. During the whole time I was in the Princess's service, I had never been called up before to make the Princess's breakfast. I slept in the houskeeper's room, on the ground floor. I opened the shutters of the window for light. I knew at that time that Captain Manby's ship was in the Downs. When I opened the the shutters, I saw the Princess, walking down the Gravel-walk towards the sea. No orders had been given me over-night to prepare breakfast early. The gentleman the Princess was with was a tall man. I was surprised to see the Princess walking with a gentleman at that time in the morning. I am sure it was the Princess."

What this evidence of Fanny Lloyd applies to, I do not feel certain that I recollect. The circumstances which she mentions might, I think, have occurred twice while I was there, and which time she alludes to, I cannot pretend to say. I mean on occasion of two water parties, which I intended; one of which did not take place at all, and the other not so early in the day as was intended, nor was its object effected. Once I intended to pay Admiral Montague a visit to Deal. But, wind and tide not serving, we sailed much later than we intended; and instead of landing at Deal, the Admiral came on board our vessel, and we returned to East Cliff in the evening, on which occasion Captain Manby was not of the party, nor was he in the Downs—but it is very possible, that having prepared to set off early, I might have walked down towards the sea, and been seen by Fanny Lloyd. On the other occasion, Captain Manby was to have been of the party, and it was to have been on board his ship. I desired him to be early at my house in the morning, and if the day suited me, we would go. He came; I walked with him towards the sea, to look at the morning: I did not like the appearance of the weather, and did not go to sea. Upon either of these occasions Fanny Lloyd might have been called up to make breakfast, and might have seen me walking. As to the orders not having been given her over night, to that I can say nothing.

But upon this statement, what inference can be intended to be drawn from this fact? It is the only one in which Fanny Lloyd's evidence can in any degree be applied to Captain Manby, and she

is one of the important witnesses referred to, as proving something which must, particularly as with regard to Captain Manby, be credited till contradicted, and as deserving the most serious consideration. From the examination of Mrs. Fitzgerald I collect, that she was asked whether Captain Manby ever slept in the house at East Cliff, to which she, to the best of her knowledge answers in the negative. Is this evidence then of Fanny Lloyd's relied upon to afford an inference that Captain Manby slept in my house; or was there at an improper hour? or in a manner, and under circumstances, which afforded reason for unfavourable interpretations? If this were so, can it be believed that I would under such circumstances, have taken a step, such as calling for breakfast, at an unusual hour, which must have made the fact more notorious and remarkable, and brought the attention of the servants, who must have waited at the breakfast, more particularly and pointedly to it?

But if there is any thing which rests, or is supposed to rest, upon the credit of this witness—though she is one of the four, whose credit your Majesty will recollect it has been stated, that there was no reason to question; yet she stands in a predicament in which, in general, at least I had understood it to be supposed, that the credit of a witness was not only questionable, but materially shaken. For, towards the beginning of her examination, she states, that Mr. Mills attended her for a cold; he asked her if the Prince came to Blackheath backwards and forwards, or something to that effect: for the Princess was with child, or looked as if she was with child. This must have been three or four years ago. She thought it must be sometime before the child (W. Austin) was brought to the Princess. To this fact she positively swears, and in this she is as positively contradicted by Mr. Mills; for he swears, in his deposition before the Commissioners, that he never did say to her, or any one, that the Princess was with child, or looked as if she was with child;—that he never thought so, nor surmised any thing of the kind. Mr. Mills has a partner, Mr. Edmeads. The Commissioners, therefore, conceiving that Fanny Lloyd might have mistaken one of the partners for the other, examine Mr. Edmeads also. Mr. Edmeads in his deposition, is equally positive, that he never said any such thing—so the matter rests upon these depositions; and

upon that state of it, what pretence is there for saying, that a witness who swears to a conversation with a medical person, who attended me of so extremely important a nature, and is so expressly and decidedly contradicted in the important fact which she speaks to, is a witness whose credit there appears no reason to question? This important circumstance must surely have been overlooked when that statement was made.

But this fact of Mr. Mills and Mr. Edmeads's contradiction of Fanny Lloyd, appears to your Majesty, for the first time, from the examination before the Commissioners. But this is the fact which I charge as having been known to those, who are concerned in bringing forward this information, and which, nevertheless, was not communicated to your Majesty.—The fact that Fanny Lloyd declared, that Mr. Mills told her the Princess was with child, is stated in the declarations which were delivered to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and by him forwarded to your Majesty.—The fact that Mr. Mills denied ever having so said, though known at the same time, is not stated.

That I may not appear to have represented so strange a fact, without sufficient authority, I subjoin the declaration of Mr. Mills, and the Deposition of Mr. Edmeads, which prove it. Fanny Lloyd's original Declaration which was delivered to His Royal Highness, is dated on the 12th of February. It appears to have been taken at the Temple; I conclude, therefore, at the chambers of Mr. Lowten, Sir John Douglas's Solicitor, who, according to Mr. Cole, accompanied him to Cheltenham to procure some of these Declarations. On the 13th of February, the next day after Fanny Lloyd's Declaration, the Earl of Moira sends for Mr. Mills upon pressing business. Mr. Mills attends him on the 14th; he is asked by his Lordship upon the subject of this conversation; he is told he may rely upon his Lordship's honour, that what passed should be in perfect confidence; (a confidence which Mr. Mills, feeling it to be on a subject too important to his character, at the moment disclaims:)—that it was his (the Earl of Moira's) duty to his Prince, as his counsellor, to inquire into the subject, which he had known for some time.—Fanny Lloyd's statement being then related to Mr. Mills, Mr. Mills, with great warmth, declared that it was an infamous falsehood.—Mr. Lowten, who appears also to have been there

by appointment, was called into the room, and he furnished Mr. Mills with the date to which Fanny Lloyd's declaration applied. The meeting ends in Lord Moira's desiring to see Mr. Mills's partner Mr. Edmeads, who, not being at home, cannot attend him for a few days. He does, however, upon his return, attend him on the 20th of May: on his attendance, instead of Mr. Lowten, he finds Mr. Conant, the magistrate, with Lord Moira. He denies the conversation with Fanny Lloyd, as positively and peremptorily as Mr. Mills. Notwithstanding, however, all this, the Declaration of Fanny Lloyd is delivered to His Royal Highness, and accompanied by these contradictions, and forwarded to your Majesty on the 29th. That Mr. Lowten was the Solicitor of Sir John Douglas in this business, cannot be doubted; that he took some of those Declarations, which were laid before your Majesty, is clear; and that he took this Declaration of Fanny Lloyd's, seems not to be questionable. That the Inquiry by Earl Moria, two days after her Declaration was taken, must have been in consequence of an early communication of it to him, seems necessarily to follow from what is above stated; that it was known, on the 14th of May, that Mr. Mills contradicted this assertion; and, on the 20th, that Mr. Edmeads did, is perfectly clear; and yet, notwithstanding all this, the fact, that Mr. Edmeads and Mr. Mills contradicted it, seems to have been not communicated to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales; for he, as it appears from the Report, forwarded the Declarations which had been delivered to His Royal Highness, through the Chancellor, to your Majesty: and the Declaration of Fanny Lloyd, which had been so falsified, to the knowledge of the Earl Moira and of Mr. Lowten, the Solicitor of Sir John Douglas, is sent in to your Majesty as one of the documents, on which you were to ground your Inquiry, unaccompanied by its falsification by Mills and Edmeads; at least, no declarations by them are amongst those, which are transmitted to me, as copies of the original Declarations which were laid before your Majesty. I know not whether it was Lord Moira, or Mr. Lowten, who should have communicated this circumstance to His Royal Highness; but that, in all fairness, it ought unquestionably to have been communicated by some one.

I dare not trust myself with any inferences from this proceed-

ing; I content myself with remarking, that it must now be felt, that I was justified in saying, that neither His Royal Highness, nor your Majesty, any more than myself, had been fairly dealt with, in not being fully informed upon this important fact; and your Majesty will forgive a weak, unprotected woman, like myself, who, under such circumstances, should apprehend that, however Sir John and Lady Douglas may appear my ostensible accusers, I have other enemies, whose ill-will I may have occasion to fear, without feeling myself assured, that it will be strictly regulated, in its proceeding against me, by the principles of fairness and of justice.

I have now, Sire, gone through all the evidence which respects Captain Manby; whether at Montague House, Southend, or East Cliff; and I do trust, that your Majesty will see, upon the whole of it, how mistaken a view the Commissioners have taken of it. The pressure of other duties engrossing their time and their attention, has made them leave the important duties of this investigation, in many particulars, imperfectly discharged—a more thorough attention to it must have given them a better and truer insight into the characters of those witnesses, upon whose credit, as I am convinced your Majesty will now see, they have without sufficient reason relied. There remains nothing for me, on this part of the charge to perform; but, adverting to the circumstance which is falsely sworn against me by Mr. Bidgood, of the salute, and the false inference and insinuation, from other facts, that Captain Manby slept in my house, either at Southend, or East Cliff, on my own part most solemnly to declare, that they are both utterly false; that Bidgood's assertion as to the salute, is a malicious slanderous invention, without the slightest shadow of truth to support it; that his suspicions and insinuations, as to Captain Manby's having slept in my house, are also the false suggestions of his own malicious mind; and that Captain Manby never did, to my knowledge or belief, sleep in my house at Southend, East Cliff, or any other house of mine whatever; and, however often he may have been in my company, I solemnly protest to your Majesty, as I have done in the former cases, that nothing ever passed between him and me, that I should be ashamed, or unwilling that all the world should have seen. And I have also, with great pain, and with a deep sense

of wounded delicacy, applied to Captain Manby to attest to the same truths, and I subjoin to this letter his Deposition to that effect.

I stated to your Majesty, that I should be obliged to return to other parts of Fanny Lloyd's testimony; at the end of it she says, "I never told Cole that M. Wilson, when she supposed the Princess to be in the library, had gone into the Princess's bedroom, and had found a man there at breakfast with the Princess; or that there was a great to do about it, and that M. Wilson was sworn to secrecy, and threatened to be turned away, if she divulged what she had seen." This part of her examination, your Majesty will perceive, must have been called from her, by some precise question, addressed to her, with respect to a supposed communication from her to Mr. Cole. In Mr. Cole's examination, there is not one word upon the subject of it. In his original declaration, however, there is, and there your Majesty will perceive, that he affirms the fact of her having reported to him Mary Wilson's declaration in the very same words in which Fanny Lloyd denies it; and it is therefore evident that the Commissioners, in putting this question to Fanny Lloyd, must have put it to her from Cole's declaration. She positively denies the fact: there is then a flat and precise contradiction, between the examination of Fanny Lloyd and the original statement of Mr. Cole. It is therefore impossible that they both can have spoken true. The Commissioners, for some reason, don't examine Cole to this point at all; don't endeavour to trace out this story: if they had, they must have discovered which of these witnesses spoke the truth, but they leave this contradiction, not only unexplained, but uninquired after, and in that state, report both these witnesses, *Cole* and *Fanny Lloyd*, who thus speak to the two sides of a contradiction, and who therefore cannot by possibility both speak truth, as witnesses who cannot be suspected of partiality, whose credit they see no reason to question, and whose story must be believed till contradicted.

But what is, if possible, still more extraordinary, this supposed communication from F. Lloyd to Cole, as your Majesty observes, relates to something which M. Wilson is supposed to have seen and to have said; yet though M. Wilson appears herself to have been examined by the Commissioners on the same

day with Fanny Lloyd, in the copy of her examination, as delivered to me, there is no trace of any question relating to this declaration having been put to her.

And I have not less reason to lament, than to be surprised, that it did not occur to the Commissioners to see the necessity of following this Inquiry still further. For, if properly pursued, it would have demonstrated two things, both very important to be kept in mind in the whole of this consideration. First, how hearsay representations of this kind, arising out of little or nothing, become magnified and exaggerated by the circulation of prejudiced, or malicious reporters: and secondly, it would have shewn the industry of Mr. and Mrs. Bidgood, as well as Mr. Cole, in collecting information in support of Lady Douglas's statement, and in improving what they collected by their false colourings, and malicious additions to it. They would have found a story in Mrs. Bidgood's declaration, as well as in her husband's, who relates it as having heard it from his wife, which is evidently the same as that which W. Cole's declaration contains. For the Bidgood's declarations state that Fanny Lloyd told Mrs. Bidgood that Mary Wilson had gone into the Princess's bed-room, and had found her Royal Highness and Sir Sidney in the most criminal situation; that she had left the room, and was so shocked, that she fainted away at the door. Here then are Mrs. Bidgood, and Mr. Cole, both declaring what they had heard Fanny Lloyd say, and Fanny Lloyd denying it. How extraordinary is it that they were not all confronted! and your Majesty will see presently how much it is to be lamented that they were not. For, from Fanny Lloyd's original declaration, it appears that the truth would have come out. As she there states that, "To the best of her knowledge Mary Wilson "said, that she had seen the Princess and Sir Sidney *in the* "*Blue Room*, but never heard Mary Wilson say she was so "alarmed as to be in a fit."

If, then, on confronting Fanny Lloyd with Mrs. Bidgood and Mr. Cole, the Commissioners had found Fanny Lloyd's story to be what she related before, and had then put the question to Mary Wilson, and had heard from her what it really was which she had seen and related to Fanny Lloyd, they could not have been at a loss to have discovered which of these witnesses told

the truth. They would have found, I am perfectly confident, that all that Mary Wilson ever could have told Fanny Lloyd, was that she had seen Sir Sidney and myself in the Blue Room, and they would then have had to refer to the malicious, and confederated inventions of the Bidgoods and Mr. Cole, for the conversion of the Blue Room, into the bed-room; for the vile slander of what M. Wilson was supposed to have seen, and for the violent effect which this scene had upon her. I say their *confederate inventions*, as it is impossible to suppose that they could have been concerned in inventing the same additions to Fanny Lloyd's story, unless they had communicated together upon it. And when they had once found Mrs. Bidgood and Mr. Cole, thus conspiring together, they would have had no difficulty in connecting them both in the same conspiracy with Sir John Douglas, by showing how connected Cole was with Sir John Douglas, and how acquainted with his proceedings, in collecting the evidence which was to support Lady Douglas's declaration.

For, by referring to Mr. Cole's declaration, made on the 23rd of February, they would have seen that Mr. Cole, in explaining some observation about Sir Sidney's supposed possession of a key to the garden door, says that it was what "Mr. Lampert, "the servant of Sir John Douglas, mentioned at Cheltenham to "Sir John Douglas and Mr. Lowten." How should Mr. Cole know that Sir John Douglas and Mr. Lowten had been down to Cheltenham, to collect evidence from this old servant of Sir John Douglas's? How should he have known what that evidence was? unless he had either accompanied them himself, or at least had had such a communication either with Sir John Douglas, or Mr. Lowten, as it never could have occurred to any of them to have made to Mr. Cole, unless, instead of being a mere witness, he were a party to this accusation? But whether they had convinced themselves that Fanny Lloyd spoke true, and Cole and Mrs. Bidgood falsely; or whether they had convinced themselves of the reverse, it could not have been possible, that they both could have spoken the truth; and, consequently, the Commissioners could never have reported the veracity of both to be free from suspicion, and deserving of credit.

There only remains that I should make a few observations on what appears in the examinations relative to Mr. Hood, (now

Lord Hood) Mr. Chester, and Captain Moore. And I really should not have thought a single observation necessary upon either of them, except that what refers to them is stated in the examinations of Mrs. Lisle.

With respect to Lord Hood it is as follows:

" I was at Catherington with the Princess;—remember Mr. " (now Lord Hood) there, and the Princess going out airing with " him, alone in Mr. Hood's little whisky;—and his servant was " with them; Mr. Hood drove, and staid out two or three times; " —more than once, three or four times. Mr. Hood dined with " us several times; once or twice he slept in a house in the gar- " den; she appeared to pay no attention to him, but that of " common civility to an intimate acquaintance." Now, Sire, it is undoubtedly true that I drove out several times with Lord Hood in his one horse chaise, and some few times, twice I believe at most, without any of my servants attending us; and considering the time of life, and the respectable character of my Lord Hood, I never should have conceived that I incurred the least danger to my reputation in so doing. If indeed it was the duty of the Commissioners to inquire into instances of my conduct, in which they may conceive it to have been less reserved and dignified, than what would properly become the exalted station which I hold in your Majesty's Royal Family, it is possible that, in the opinions of some, these drives with my Lord Hood were not consistent with that station; and that they were particularly improper in those instances in which we were not attended by more servants, or any servants of my own.

Upon this I have only to observe, that these instances occurred after I had received the news of the lamented death of your Majesty's brother, the Duke of Gloucester. I was at that time down by the sea side for my health. I did not like to forego the advantage of air and exercise for the short remainder of the time which I had to stay there, and I purposely chose to go out, not in my own carriage, and unattended, that I might not be seen, and known to be driving about (myself and my attendants out of mourning) while his Royal Highness was known to have been so recently dead. This statement, however, is all that I have to make upon my part of the case, and whatever indecorum or impropriety of behaviour the Commissioners have fixed upon me

by this circumstance, it must remain; for I cannot deny the truth of the fact, and have only the above explanation to offer of it. As to what Mrs. Lisle's examination contains with respect to Mr. Chester and Captain Moore, it is so connected, that I must trouble your Majesty with the statement of it altogether.

" I was with her Royal Highness at Lady Sheffield's at Christmas, in Sussex; I inquired what company was there when I came, —she said, only Mr. John Chester, who was there by her Royal Highness's orders; that she could get no other company to meet her, on account of the roads, and the season of the year. He dined and slept there that night; the next day other company came; Mr. Chester remained. I heard her Royal Highness say she had been ill in the night, and came out for a light, and lighted her candle in her servant's room. I returned from Sheffield-place to Blackheath with the Princess. Captain Moore dined there; I left him and the Princess twice alone, for a short time; he might be alone half an hour with her in the room below, in which we had been sitting. I went to look for a book to compleat a set her Royal Highness was lending Captain Moore. She made him a present of an inkstand, to the best of my recollection. He was there one morning in January last, on the Princess Charlotte's birth-day; he went away before the rest of the company. I might be about twenty minutes the second time I was away, the night Captain Moore was there. At Lady Sheffield's her Royal Highness paid more attention to Mr. Chester than to the rest of the company. I know of her Royal Highness walking out alone, twice, with Mr. Chester in the morning alone; once, a short time, it rained, the other not an hour, not long. Mr. Chester is a pretty young man; her attentions to him were not uncommon; not the same as to Captain Manby."

And first, Sire, as to what relates to Mr. Chester. If there is any imputation to be cast upon my character by what passed at Sheffield-place with Mr. Chester, (and by the Commissioners returning to examine Mrs. Lisle upon my attention to Mr. Chester, my walking out with him, and above all, " as to his being a pretty young man," I conceive it to be so intended) I am sure your Majesty will see that it is the hardest thing imaginable upon me, that, upon an occurrence which passed in Lady Sheffield's house, on a visit to her, Lady Sheffield herself was never

examined, for if she had been, I am convinced that these Noble Lords, the Commissioners, never could have put me to the painful degradation of stating any thing upon this subject.

The statement begins by Mrs. Lisle's inquiring, what company was there? and Lady Sheffield saying, "only Mr. John Chester, who was there by her Royal Highness's orders; that she could get no other company on account of the roads." Is not this, Sire, left open to the inference that Mr. John Chester was the only person who had been invited by my orders? If Lady Sheffield had been examined, she would have been able to have produced the very letter in which, in answer to her Ladyship's request, that I would let her know what company it would be agreeable for me to meet, I said, "every thing of the name of North, all the Legge's, and Chester's, William and John, &c. &c. and Mr. Elliott." Instead of singling out, therefore, Mr. John Chester, I included him in the enumeration which I made of the near relations of Lady Sheffield; and your Majesty from this alone cannot fail to see how false a colour, even a true fact can assume, if it be not sufficiently inquired into and explained.

As to the circumstances of my having been taken ill in the night, being obliged to get up, and light my candle; why this fact should be recorded, I am wholly at a loss to conceive. All the circumstances however, respecting it, connected very much as they are with the particular disposition of Lady Sheffield's house, would have been fully explained, if thought material to have been inquired after, by Lady Sheffield herself; and I should have been relieved from the painful degradation of alluding at all to a circumstance which I could not further detail, without a great degree of indelicacy; and as I cannot possibly suppose such a detail can be necessary for my defence, it would, especially in addressing your Majesty, be wholly inexcusable. With respect to the attention which I paid to Mr. Chester, and my walking out twice alone with him for a *short time*, I know not how to notice it. At this distance of time I am not certain that I can, with perfect accuracy, account for the circumstance. It appears to have been a rainy morning; it was on the 27th or 28th of December; and whether, wishing to take a walk, I did not desire Lady Sheffield, or Mrs. Lisle, or any lady, to accompany me in doing what, in such a morning, I might think might

be disagreeable to them, I really cannot precisely state to your Majesty.

But here again, perhaps, in the judgment of some persons, may be an instance of familiarity, which was not consistent with the dignity of the Princess of Wales; but surely prejudice against me and my character must exceed all natural bounds in those minds in which any inference of crime or moral depravity can be drawn from such a fact. As to Captain Moore, it seems he was left alone with me, and twice in one afternoon by Mrs. Lisle; he was alone with me half an hour. The first time Mrs. Lisle left us, her examination says, it was to look for a book which I wished to lend to Captain Moore. How long she was absent on that occasion she is not asked, but it could have been but ten minutes, as she appears to have been absent twenty minutes the second time. The Commissioners, though they particularly return to the inquiry with respect to the length of time of her second absence, did not require her to tell them the occasion of it: if they had, she would have told them, that it was in search of the same book; that having on the first occasion looked for it in the drawing-room, she went afterwards to seek for it in Mrs. Fitzgerald's room.—But I made him a present of an inkstand. I hope your Majesty will not think I am trifling with your patience when I take notice of such trifles. But it is of such trifles as these, that the evidence consists, when it is the evidence of respectable witnesses speaking to facts, and consequently speaking only the truth. Captain Moore had conferred on me what I felt as a considerable obligation. My mother is very partial to the late Dr. Moore's writings, Captain Moore, as your Majesty knows, is his son, and he promised to lend me, for the purpose of sending it to my mother, a manuscript of an unpublished work of the Doctor's. In return for this civility I begged his acceptance of a trifling present.

There is one circumstance alluded to in these examinations, which I know not how to notice, and yet feel it impossible to omit—I mean what respects certain anonymous papers, or letters, marked A. B. and C. to which Lord Cholmondely appears to have been examined, upon the supposition of their being my handwriting. A letter marked A. appears, by the examination of Lady Douglas, to have been produced by her; and the two

marked B. and a cover marked C. appear to have been produced by Sir John. These papers I have never seen; but I collect them to be the same as are alluded to in Lady Douglas's original declaration, and from her representation of them, they are most infamous productions. From the style and language of the letter, she says, Sir J. Douglas, Sir S. Smith and herself, would have no manner of hesitation in swearing point blank (for that is her phrase) to their being in my hand-writing; and it seems, from the statement of His Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, that Sir Sidney Smith had been imposed upon to believe, that these letters and papers were really written and sent to Sir John and Lady Douglas by me. I cannot help, however, remarking to your Majesty, that though Sir John and Lady Douglas produce these papers, and mark them, yet neither the one nor the other swears to their belief of my hand-writing; it does not, indeed, appear that they were asked the question; and when it once occurred to the Commissioners to be material to inquire whose hand-writing these papers were, I should have been much surprised at their not applying to Sir John and Lady Douglas to swear it, as in their original Declaration they offer to do, if it had not been that, by that time, I suppose, the Commissioners had satisfied themselves of the true value of Sir John and Lady Douglas's oaths, and therefore did not think it worth while to ask them any further questions.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, as appears by his narrative, was convinced, by Sir Sidney Smith, that these letters came from me. His Royal Highness had been applied to by me, in consequence of my having received a formal note from Sir John, Lady Douglas, and Sir Sidney Smith, requesting an audience immediately; this was soon after my having desired to see no more of Lady Douglas. I conceived, therefore, the audience was required for the purpose of remonstrance, and explanation upon this circumstance, and as I was determined not to alter my resolution, nor admit of any discussion upon it, I requested His Royal Highness, who happened to be acquainted with Sir Sidney Smith, to try to prevent my having any further trouble upon the subject. His Royal Highness saw Sir Sidney Smith, and being impressed by him with the belief of Lady Douglas's story, that I was the author of these anonymous letters,

these letters are at all to be alluded to in their Report, or the examinations accompanying it, surely I ought to have had the benefit of the other evidence, which disproved my connection with them.

I have now, Sire, gone through all the matters contained in the examination, on which I think it, in any degree, necessary, to trouble your Majesty with any observations.—For as to the examination of Mrs. Townley the washerwoman, if it applies at all, it must have been intended to have afforded evidence of my pregnancy and miscarriage.—And whether the circumstance she speaks to was occasioned by my having been bled with leeches, or whether an actual miscarriage did take place in my family, and by some means linen belonging to me was procured and used upon the occasion; or to whatever other circumstance it is to be ascribed, after the manner in which the Commissioners have expressed their opinion, on the part of the case respecting my supposed pregnancy, and after the evidence on which they formed their opinion, I do not conceive myself called upon to say any thing upon it; or that any thing I could say could be more satisfactory than repeating the opinion of the Commissioners, as stated in their Report, viz. "That nothing had appeared to them which would warrant the belief that I was pregnant in that year, (1802), or at any other period within the compass of their Inquiries—that they would not be warranted in expressing any doubt respecting the alleged pregnancy of the Princess, as stated in the original declarations, a fact so fully contradicted, and by so many witnesses, to whom, if true, it must in various ways have been known, that we cannot think it entitled to the smallest credit."

There are indeed some other matters mentioned in the original declarations, which I might have found it necessary to observe upon; but as the Commissioners do not appear to have entered into any examination with respect to them, I content myself with thinking that they had found the means of satisfying themselves of the utter falsehood of those particulars, and therefore that they can require no contradiction or observation from me.

On the declaration, therefore, and the evidence, I have nothing further to remark. And, conscious of the length at which I have trespassed on your Majesty's patience, I will forbear to waste

your time by any endeavour to recapitulate what I have said. Some few observations, however, before I conclude, I must hope to be permitted to subjoin.

In many of the observations which I have made, your Majesty will observe that I have noticed, what have appeared to me to be great omissions on the part of the Commissioners, in the manner of taking their examinations; in forbearing to put any questions to the witnesses, in the nature of a cross-examination of them;—to confront them with each other; and to call other witnesses, whose testimony must either have confirmed or falsified, in important particulars, the examinations as they have taken them. It may perhaps occur, in consequence of such observations, that I am desirous that this Inquiry should be opened again; that the Commissioners should recommence their labours, and that they should proceed to supply the defects in their previous examinations, by a fuller execution of their duty.—I therefore think it necessary, most distinctly and emphatically to state, that I have no such meaning; and whatever may be the risk that I may incur of being charged with betraying a consciousness of guilt, by thus flying from an extension or repetition of this Inquiry, I must distinctly state, that so far from requesting the revival of it, I humbly request your Majesty would be graciously pleased to understand me as remonstrating, and protesting against it, in the strongest and most solemn manner in my power.

I am yet to learn the legality of such a Commission to inquire, even in the case of High Treason, or any other crime known to the laws of the country. If it is lawful in the case of High Treason, supposed to be committed by me, surely it must be lawful also in the case of High Treason supposed to be committed by other subjects of your Majesty.

That there is much objection to it, in reason and principle, my understanding assures me. That such Inquiries, carried on upon *ex parte* examination, and a Report of the result by persons of high authority, may, nay must, have a tendency to prejudice the character of the parties who are exposed to them, and thereby influence the further proceedings in their case;—that are calculated to keep back from notice, and in security, the person of a false accuser, and to leave the accused in the predicament of neither being able to look forward for protection to an acquittal

of himself, nor for redress to the conviction of his accuser.—That these and many other objections occur to such a mode of proceeding, in the case of a crime known to the laws of this country, appears to be quite obvious.—But if Commissioners acting under such a power, or your Majesty's Privy Council, or any regular Magistrates, when they have satisfied themselves of the falsehood of the principal charge, and the absence of all legal and substantive offence, are to be considered as empowered to proceed in the examination of the particulars of private life; to report upon the proprieties of domestic conduct; and the decorum of private behaviour, and to pronounce their opinion against the party, upon the evidence of dissatisfied servants, whose veracity they are to hold up as unimpeachable, and to do this without permitting the persons whose conduct is inquired into, to suggest one word in explanation or contradiction of the matter with which they are charged: it would, I submit to your Majesty, prove such an attack upon the security and confidence of domestic life, such a means of recording, under the sanction of great names and high authority, the most malicious, and foulest imputations, that no character could possibly be secure; and would do more to break in upon and undermine the happiness and comfort of life, than any proceeding which could be imagined.

The public in general perhaps may feel not much interest in the establishment of such a precedent in my case. They may think it to be a course of proceeding scarcely applicable to any private subject; yet, if once such a court of honour, of decency, and of manners, was established, many subjects might occur to which it might be thought advisable to extend its jurisdiction, beyond the instance of a Princess of Wales. But should it be intended to be confined to me, your Majesty, I trust, will not be surprised to find that it does not reconcile me the better to it, should I learn myself to be the single instance in your kingdom, who is exposed to the scrutiny of so severe and formidable a tribunal. So far therefore from giving that sanction or consent to any fresh Inquiry, upon similar principles, which I should seem to do, by requiring the renewal of these examinations, I must protest against it: protest against the nature of the proceeding, because its result cannot be fair; I must protest, as long at least

as it remains doubtful, against the legality of what has already passed, as well as the legality of its repetition.—If the course be legal, I must submit to the laws, however severe they may be. But I trust new law is not to be found out, and applied to my case.—If I am guilty of crime, I know I am amenable, I am most contented to continue so, to the impartial laws of your Majesty's kingdom; and I fear no charge brought against me, in open day, under the public eye, before the known tribunals of the country, administering justice under those impartial and enlightened laws. But secret tribunals, created for the first time for me, to form and pronounce opinions upon my conduct, without hearing me; to record in the evidence of the witnesses which they report, imputations against my character upon *ex parte* examinations,—till I am better reconciled to the justice of their proceedings, I cannot fail to fear. And till I am better informed as to their legality, I cannot fail in duty to my dearest interests, most solemnly to remonstrate and to protest against them.

If such tribunals as these are called into action against me by the false charges of friends turned enemies, of servants turned traitors, and acting as spies by the foul conspiracy of such social and domestic treason; I can look to no security to my honour in the most spotless and most cautious innocence.

By the contradiction and denial which in this case I have been enabled to procure, of the most important facts which have been sworn against me by Mr. Cole and Mr. Bidgood;—by the observations, and the reasonings, which I have addressed to your Majesty, I am confident, that to those whose sense of justice will lead them to wade through this long detail, I shall have removed the impressions which have been raised against me.—But how am I to insure a patient attention to all this statement? How many will hear that the Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench, the First Lord of the Treasury, and one of your Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, have reported against me, upon evidence which they have declared to be unbiassed and unquestionable; who will never have the opportunity, or if they had the opportunity, might not have the inclination, to correct the error of that Report, by the examination of my statement.

I feel, therefore, that by this proceeding, my character has received essential injury. For a Princess of Wales to have been

placed in a situation, in which it was essential to her honour to request one gentleman to swear, that he was not locked up at midnight in a room with her alone: and another, that he did not give her a lascivious salute, and never slept in her house, is to have been actually degraded and disgraced.—I have been, Sire, placed in this situation, I have been cruelly, your Majesty will permit me to say so, cruelly degraded into the necessity of making such requests. A necessity which I never could have been exposed to, even under this Inquiry, if more attention had been given to the examination of these malicious charges, and of the evidence on which they rest.

Much solicitude is felt, and justly so, as connected with this Inquiry, for the honour of your Majesty's illustrious Family. But surely a true regard to that honour should have restrained those who really felt for it, from casting such severe reflections on the character and virtue of the Princess of Wales.

If, indeed, after the most diligent and anxious Inquiry, penetrating into every circumstance connected with the charge, searching every source from which information could be derived, and scrutinizing with all that acuteness into the credit and character of the witnesses, which great experience, talent, and intelligence could bring to such a subject; and above all, if, after giving me some opportunity of being heard, the force of truth had, at length, compelled any persons to form, as reluctantly, and as unwillingly as they would, against their own daughters, the opinion that has been pronounced; no regard, unquestionably, to my honour and character, nor to that of your Majesty's Family, as in some degree, involved in mine, could have justified the suppression of that opinion, if legally called for, in the course of official and public duty. Whether such caution and reluctance are really manifest in these proceedings, I must leave to less partial judgments than my own to determine.

In the full examination of these proceedings, which justice to my own character has required of me, I have been compelled to make many observations, which, I fear, may prove offensive to persons in high power—Your Majesty will easily believe, when I solemnly assure you that I have been deeply sorry to yield to the necessity of so doing. This proceeding manifests that I have enemies enough: I could not wish unnecessarily to increase

their number, or their weight. I trust, however, I have done it, I know it has been my purpose to do it, in a manner as little offensive as the justice due to myself would allow of; but I have felt that I have been deeply injured; that I have had much to complain of; and that my silence now would not be taken for forbearance, but would be ascribed to me as a confession of guilt. The Report itself announced to me, that these things which had been spoken to by the witnesses, "great improprieties and indecencies of conduct," "necessarily occasioning most unfavourable interpretations, and deserving the most serious consideration, must be credited till decidedly contradicted." The most satisfactory disproof of these circumstances (as the contradiction of the accused is always received with caution and distrust) rested in the proof of the foul malice and falsehood of my accusers and their witnesses. The Report announced to Your Majesty that those witnesses, whom I felt to be foul confederates in a base conspiracy against me, were not to be suspected of unfavourable bias, and their veracity, in the judgment of the Commissioners, not to be questioned.

Under these circumstances, Sire, what could I do? Could I forbear, in justice to myself, to announce to Your Majesty the existence of a conspiracy against my honour, and my station in this country at least, if not against my life? Could I forbear to point out to Your Majesty, how long this intended mischief had been meditated against me? Could I forbear to point out my doubts, at least, of the legality of the Commission, under which the proceeding had been had? or to point out the errors and inaccuracies, into which the great and able men who were named in the commission under the hurry and pressure of their great official occupations, had fallen, in the execution of this duty? Could I forbear to state, and to urge, the great injustice and injury that had been done to my character and my honour, by opinions pronounced against me without hearing me? And if, in the execution of this great task, so essential to my honour, I have let drop any expressions which a colder, and more cautious prudence, would have checked, I appeal to your Majesty's warm heart, and generous feelings, to suggest my excuse, and to afford my pardon.

What I have said, I have said under the pressure of much

misfortune, under the provocation of great and accumulated injustice. Oh! Sire, to be unfortunate, and scarce to feel at liberty to lament; to be cruelly used, and to feel it almost an offence and a duty to be silent is a hard lot; but use had, in some degree inured me to it; but to find my misfortunes and my injuries imputed to me as faults; to be called to account upon a charge, made against me by Lady Douglas, who was thought at first worthy of credit, although she had pledged her veracity to the fact, of my having admitted that I was myself the aggressor in every thing, of which I had to complain, has subdued all power of patient bearing, and when I was called upon by the Commissioners, either to admit, by my silence, the guilt which they imputed to me, or to enter into my defence, in contradiction to it—no longer at liberty to remain silent, I perhaps have not known how, with exact propriety, to limit my expressions.

In happier days of my life, before my spirit had been yet at all lowered by my misfortunes, I should have been disposed to have met such a charge with the contempt which, I trust, by this time, your Majesty thinks due to it; I should have been disposed to have defied my enemies to the utmost, and to have scorned to answer to any thing but a legal charge, before a competent tribunal; but in my present misfortunes, such force of mind is gone. I ought perhaps, so far to be thankful to them for their wholesome lessons of humility. I have, therefore entered into this long detail, to endeavour to remove, at the first possible opportunity, any unfavourable impressions; to rescue myself from the dangers which the continuance of these suspicions might occasion, and to preserve to me your Majesty's good opinion, in whose kindness, hitherto, I have found infinite consolation, and to whose justice, under all circumstances, I can confidently appeal.

Under the impression of these sentiments I throw myself at your Majesty's feet. I know that whatever sentiments of resentment; whatever wish for redress, by the punishment of my false accusers, I ought to feel, your Majesty, as the Father of a Stranger, smarting under false accusation, as the Head of your illustrious House dishonoured in me, and as the great Guardian of the Laws of your Kingdom, thus foully attempted

to have been applied to the purposes of injustice, will not fail to feel for me. At all events, I trust your Majesty, will restore me to the blessing of your Gracious Presence, and confirm to me, by your own Gracious Words, your satisfactory conviction of my innocence.

I am,
SIRE,
With every sentiment of Gratitude and Loyalty,
Your Majesty's most affectionate
and dutiful Daughter-in-Law,
Subject, and Servant,
C. P.

Montague House,
Oct. 2, 1806.

(No. II.)

Letter from her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales to his late Majesty King George the Third.

SIRE,

BY my short letter to your Majesty of the 12th instant, in answer to your Majesty's communication of the 10th, I notified my intention of representing to your Majesty the various grounds on which I felt the hardship of my case and a review of which, I confidently hoped, would dispose your Majesty to recal your determination to adjourn, to an indefinite period, my reception into your Royal presence; a determination which, in addition to all the other pain which it brought along with it, affected me with the disappointment of hopes, which I had fondly cherished, with the most perfect confidence, because they rested on your Majesty's gracious assurance.

Independently, however, of that communication from your Majesty, I should have felt myself bound to have troubled your Majesty with much of the contents of the present letter.

Upon the receipt of the paper which, by your Majesty's commands, was transmitted to me by the Lord Chancellor, on the 28th of last month, and which communicated to me the joyful intelligence, that your Majesty was "advised that it was no longer necessary for you to decline receiving me into your royal presence," I conceived myself necessarily called upon to send an immediate answer to so much of it as respected that intelligence. I could not wait the time, which it would have required, to state those observations, which it was impossible for me to refrain from making, at some period, upon the other important particulars which that paper contained. Accordingly, I answered it immediately; and, as your Majesty's gracious and instant reply of last Thursday fortnight, announced to me your pleasure, that I should be received by your Majesty, on a day subsequent to the

then ensuing week, I was led most confidently to assure myself, that the last week would not have passed, without my having received that satisfaction. I therefore determined to wait in patience, without further intrusion upon your Majesty, till I might have the opportunity of guarding myself from the possibility of being misunderstood, by personally explaining to your Majesty, that, whatever observations I had to make upon the paper so communicated to me, on the 28th ultimo, and whatever complaints respecting the delay, and the many cruel circumstances which had attended the whole of the proceedings against me, and the unsatisfactory state, in which they were at length left by that last communication, they were observations and complaints which affected those only, under whose advice your Majesty had acted, and were not, in any degree, intended to intimate even the most distant insinuation against your Majesty's justice or kindness.

That paper established the opinion, which I certainly had ever confidently entertained, but the justness of which I had not before any document to establish, that your Majesty had, from the first, deemed this proceeding a high and important matter of state, in the consideration of which your Majesty had not felt yourself at liberty to trust to your own generous feelings, and to your own royal and gracious judgment. I never did believe, that the cruel state of anxiety, in which I had been kept, ever since the delivery of my answer, (for at least sixteen weeks), could be at all attributable to your Majesty: it was most unlike every thing which I had ever experienced from your Majesty's condescension, feeling, and justice; and I found, from that paper, that it was to your confidential servants I was to ascribe the length of banishment from your presence, which they, at last, advised your Majesty, it was no longer necessary should be continued. I perceive, therefore, what I always believed, that it was to them, and to them only, that I owed the protracted continuance of my sufferings, and of my disgrace; and that your Majesty, considering the whole of this proceeding to have been instituted and conducted under the grave responsibility of your Majesty's servants, had not thought proper to take any step, or express any opinion, upon any part of it, but such as was recommended by their advice. Influenced by these sentiments, and anxious to have the oppor-

tunity of conveying them, with the overflowings of a grateful heart, to your Majesty, what were my sensations of surprise, mortification, and disappointment, on the receipt of your Majesty's letter of the 10th instant, your Majesty may conceive, though I am utterly unable to express.

That letter announces to me, that his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, upon receiving the several documents which your Majesty directed your cabinet to transmit to him, made a personal communication to your Majesty of his intention to put them into the hands of his lawyers, accompanied by a request, that your Majesty would suspend any further steps in the business, until the Prince of Wales should be enabled to submit to your Majesty the statement which he proposed to make; and it also announces to me that your Majesty therefore considered it incumbent on you to defer naming a day to me, until the further result of the Prince of Wales's intention should have been made known to your Majesty.

This determination of your Majesty, on this request, made by his Royal Highness, I humbly trust your Majesty will permit me to entreat you, in your most gracious justice, to reconsider. Your Majesty, I am convinced, must have been surprised at the time, and prevailed upon by the importunity of the Prince of Wales to think this determination necessary, or your Majesty's generosity and justice would never have adopted it. And if I can satisfy your Majesty of the unparalleled injustice and cruelty of this interposition of the Prince of Wales, at such a time, and under such circumstances, I feel the most perfect confidence that your Majesty will hasten to recal it.

I should basely be wanting to my own interest and feelings, if I did not plainly state my sense of that injustice and cruelty; and if I did not most loudly complain of it. Your Majesty will better perceive the just grounds of my complaint, when I retrace the course of these proceedings from their commencement.

The four noble lords, appointed by your Majesty to inquire into the charges brought against me, in their Report of the 14th of July last, after having stated that his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales had had laid before him the charge which was made against me by Lady Douglas, and the declaration in support of it, proceed in the following manner:—

" In the painful situation in which his Royal Highness was placed by these communications, we learnt that his Royal Highness had adopted *the only course* which could, in our judgment, with propriety be followed. When informations such as these had been thus confidently alleged, and particularly detailed, and had been in some degree supported by collateral evidence, applying to other facts of the same nature, (though going to a far less extent,) *one line only* could be pursued.

" Every sentiment of duty to your Majesty, and of concern for the public welfare, required that these particulars should not be withheld from your Majesty, to whom more particularly belonged the cognizance of a matter of state, so nearly touching the honour of your Majesty's royal family, and, by possibility, affecting the succession of your Majesty's crown.

" Your Majesty had been pleased, on your part, to view the subject in the same light. Considering it as a matter which, on every account, demanded the most immediate investigation, your Majesty had thought fit to commit into our hands, the duty of ascertaining, in the first instance, what degree of credit was due to the information, and thereby enabling your Majesty to decide what further conduct to adopt respecting them."

His Royal Highness then pursuing, as the four lords say, *the only course* which could, in their judgment, with propriety be pursued, submitted the matter to your Majesty.—Your Majesty directed the inquiry by the four noble lords.—The four lords, in their report upon the case, justly acquitted me of all crime, and expressed (I will not wait now to say how unjustly) the credit which they gave, and the consequence they ascribed to other matters, which they did not, however, characterize as amounting to any crime.—To this report I made my answer.—That answer, together with the whole proceedings, was referred by your Majesty to the same four noble lords, and others of your Majesty's confidential servants. They advised your Majesty, amongst much other matter, (which must be the subject of further observations) that there was no longer any reason why you should decline receiving me.

Your Majesty will necessarily conceive that I have always looked upon my banishment from your royal presence as, in fact, a punishment, and a severe one too. I thought it sufficiently

hard, that I should have been suffering that punishment, during the time that this inquiry has been pending, while I was yet only under accusation, and upon the principles of the just laws of your Majesty's kingdom, entitled to be presumed to be innocent, till I was proved to be guilty. But I find this does not appear to be enough, in the opinion of the Prince of Wales. For now, when after this long inquiry, into matters which required immediate investigation, I have been acquitted of every thing which could call for my banishment from your royal presence;—after your Majesty's confidential servants have thus expressly advised your Majesty that they see no reason why you should any longer decline to receive me into your presence;—after your Majesty had graciously notified to me, your determination to receive me at an early day, His Royal Highness interposes the demand of a new delay; desires your Majesty not to take any step, desires you not to act upon the advice which your own confidential servants have given you, that you need no longer decline seeing me;—not to execute your intention and assurance, that you would receive me at an early day; because he has laid the documents before his lawyers, and intends to prepare a further statement. And the judgment of your Majesty's confidential servants is, as it were, appealed from by the Prince of Wales, (whom, from this time at least, I must be permitted to consider as assuming the character of my accuser;) the justice due to me is to be suspended, while the judgment of your Majesty's sworn servants is to be submitted to the revision of my accuser's counsel; and I, though acquitted, in the opinion of your Majesty's confidential servants, of all that should induce your Majesty to decline seeing me, am to have that punishment, which had been inflicted upon me during the inquiry, continued after that acquittal, till a fresh statement is prepared, to be again submitted, for aught I know, to another inquiry, of as extended a continuance as that which has just terminated.

Can it be said that the proceedings of the four noble lords, or of your Majesty's confidential servants, have been so lenient and considerate towards me and my feelings, as to induce a suspicion that I have been too favourably dealt with by them? and that the advice which has been given to your Majesty, that your Majesty need no longer decline to receive me, was hastily and

partially delivered? I am confident that your Majesty must see the very reverse of this to be the case—that I have every reason to complain of the inexplicable delay which so long withheld that advice. And the whole character of the observations with which they accompanied it, marks the reluctance with which they yielded to the necessity of giving it.

For your Majesty's confidential servants advise your Majesty, "that it is no longer necessary for you to decline receiving me into your royal presence." If this is their opinion and their advice now, why was it not their opinion and their advice four months ago, from the date of my answer? Nay, why was it not their opinion and advice from the date even of the original report itself? For not only had they been in possession of my answer for above *sixteen weeks*, which at least furnished them with all the materials on which this advice at length was given, but further, your Majesty's confidential servants are forward to state, that after having read my observations, and the affidavits which were annexed to them, they agree in *the opinions* (not in any single opinion upon any particular branch of the case, but in *the opinions generally*) which were submitted to your Majesty in the original report of the four lords. If therefore, (notwithstanding their concurrence in *all* the opinions contained in the Report,) they have nevertheless given to your Majesty their advice, "that it is no longer necessary for you to decline receiving me;"—what could have prevented their offering that advice, even from the 14th of July, the date of the original report itself? Or what could have warranted the withholding it, even for a single moment? Instead, therefore, of any trace being observable of hasty, precipitate, and partial determination in my favour, it is impossible to interpret their conduct and their reasons together in any other sense, than as amounting to an admission of your Majesty's confidential servants themselves, that I have, in consequence of their withholding that advice, been unnecessarily and cruelly banished from your royal presence, from the 14th of July, to the 28th of January, including a space of above six months; and the effect of the interposition of the Prince, is to prolong my sufferings and my disgrace, under the same banishment, to a period perfectly indefinite.

The principle which will admit the effect of such interposition

now, may be acted upon again; and the Prince may require a further prolongation, upon fresh statements, and fresh charges, kept back possibly for the purpose of being, from time to time, conveniently interposed to prevent for ever the arrival of that hour, which, displaying to the world the acknowledgment of my unmerited sufferings and disgrace, may at the same time, expose the true, malicious, and unjust quality of the proceedings which have been so long carried on against me.

This unreasonable, unjust, and cruel interposition of His Royal Highness, as I must ever deem it, has prevailed upon your Majesty to recal, to my prejudice, your gracious purpose of receiving me in pursuance of the advice of your servants. Do I then flatter myself too much, when I feel assured, that my *just* entreaty, founded upon the reasons which I urge, and directed to counteract only the effect of that *unjust* interposition, will induce your Majesty to return to your original determination?

Restored however, as I should feel myself, to a state of comparative security, as well as credit, by being at length permitted, upon your Majesty's gracious reconsideration of your last determination, to have access to your Majesty; yet under all the circumstances under which I should now receive that mark and confirmation of your Majesty's opinion of my innocence, my character would not, I fear, stand cleared in the public opinion, by the mere fact of your Majesty's reception of me. This revocation of your Majesty's gracious purpose has flung an additional cloud about the whole proceeding, and the inferences drawn in the public mind from this circumstance, so mysterious, and so perfectly inexplicable, upon any grounds which are open to their knowledge, has made, and will leave so deep an impression to my prejudice, as scarce any thing short of a public exposure of all that has passed, can possibly efface.

The publication of all these proceedings to the world, then seems to me, under the present circumstances, (whatever reluctance I feel against such a measure, and however I regret the hard necessity which drives me to it,) to be almost the only remaining resource, for the vindication of my honour and character. The falsehood of the accusation is, by no means, all that will, by such publication, appear to the credit and clearance of my character; but the course in which the whole proceedings

have been carried on, or rather delayed, by those to whom your Majesty referred the consideration of them, will shew, that whatever measure of justice I may have ultimately received at their hands, it is not to be suspected as arising from any merciful and indulgent consideration of me, of my feelings, or of my case.

It will be seen how my feelings had been harassed, and my character and honour exposed, by the delays which have taken place in these proceedings; it will be seen, that the existence of the charge against me had avowedly been known to the public, from the 7th of June in the last year.—I say known to the public, because it was on that day that the Commissioners, acting, as I am to suppose, (for so they state in their report) under the anxious wish that their trust should be executed with as little publicity as possible, authorized that unnecessary insult and outrage upon me, as I must always consider it, which, however intended, gave the utmost publicity and exposure to the existence of these charges—I mean the sending two attornies, armed with their lordships' warrant, to my house, to bring before them at once about one half of my household for examination. The idea of privacy, after an act so much calculated, from the extraordinary nature of it, to excite the greatest attention and surprise, your Majesty must feel to have been impossible and absurd; for an attempt at secrecy, mystery, and concealment, on my part, could under such circumstances, only have been construed into the fearfulness of guilt.

It will appear also, that from that time, I heard nothing authentically upon the subject till the 11th of August, when I was furnished, by your Majesty's commands, with the Report. The several papers necessary to my understanding the whole of these charges, in the authentic state in which your Majesty thought it proper graciously to direct that I should have them, were not delivered to me till the beginning of September. My answer to these various charges, though the whole subject of them was new to those whose advice I had recourse to, long as that answer was necessarily obliged to be, was delivered to the Lord Chancellor, to be forwarded to your Majesty by the 6th of October; and, from the 6th of October to the 28th of January, I was kept in total ignorance of the effect of that answer. Not only will all this delay be apparent, but it will be generally shewn

to the world how your Majesty's servants had, in this important business, treated your daughter-in-law, the Princess of Wales; and what measure of justice she, a female, and a stranger in your land, has experienced at their hands.

Undoubtedly against such a proceeding I have ever felt, and still feel, an almost invincible repugnance. Every sentiment of delicacy, with which a female mind must shrink from the act of bringing before the public such charges, however conscious of their scandal and falsity, and however clearly that scandal and falsity may be manifested by the answer to those charges;—the respect still due from me, to persons employed in authority under your Majesty, however little respect I may have received from them;—my duty to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales;—my regard for all the members of your august family;—my esteem, my duty, my gratitude to your Majesty,—my affectionate gratitude for all the paternal kindness which I have ever experienced from you;—my anxiety, not only to avoid the risk of giving any offence or displeasure to your Majesty, but also to fly from every occasion of creating the slightest sentiment of uneasiness in the mind of your Majesty, whose happiness it would be the pride and pleasure of my life to consult, and to promote; all these various sentiments have compelled me to submit, as long as human forbearance could endure, to all the unfavourable inferences which were, through this delay, daily increasing in the public mind. What the strength and efficacy of these motives have been, your Majesty will do me the justice to feel, when you are pleased, graciously, to consider how long I have been contented to suffer those suspicions to exist against my innocence, which the bringing before the public of my accusation and my defence to it, would so indisputably and immediately have dispelled.

The measure, however, of making these proceedings public, whatever mode I can adopt (considering especially the absolute impossibility of suffering any partial production of them, and the necessity that, if for any purpose any part of them should be produced, the whole must be brought before the public,) remains surrounded with all the objections which I have enumerated; and nothing could ever have prevailed upon me, or can now even prevail upon me to have recourse to it, but an imperious sense of

indispensable duty to my future safety, to my present character and honour, and to the feelings, the character, and the interests of my child. I had flattered myself, when once this long proceeding should have terminated, in my reception into your Majesty's presence, that that circumstance alone would have so strongly implied my innocence of all that had been brought against me, as to have been perfectly sufficient for my honour and my security; but accompanied, as it now must be, with the knowledge of the fact, that your Majesty has been brought to hesititate upon its propriety, and accompanied also with the very unjustifiable observations, as they appear to me, on which I shall presently proceed to remark; and which were made by your Majesty's servants, at the time when they gave you their advice to receive me; I feel myself in a situation, in which I deeply regret that I cannot rest, in silence, without an immediate reception into your Majesty's presence; nor, indeed, with that reception, unless it be attended by other circumstances, which may mark my satisfactory acquittal of the charges which have been brought against me.

It shall at no time be said, with truth, that I shrunk back from these infamous charges; that I crouched before my enemies, and courted them, by my submission, into moderation? No; I have ever boldly defied them. I have ever felt and still feel, that if they should think, either of pursuing these accusations, or of bringing forward any other which the wickedness of individuals may devise, to affect my honour; (since my conscience tells me that they must be as base and groundless as those brought by Lady Douglas,) while the witnesses to the innocence of my conduct are all living, I should be able to disprove them all; and, whoever may be my accusers, to triumph over their wickedness and malice. But should these accusations be renewed; or any other be brought forward, in any future time, death may, I know not how soon, remove from my innocence its best security, and deprive me of the means of my justification, and my defence.

There are therefore other measures, which I trust your Majesty will think indispensable to be taken, for my honour and for my security.—Amongst these, I most humbly submit to your Majesty my most earnest entreaties that the proceedings, including not only my first answer, and my letter of the 8th of December, but

this letter also, may be directed by your Majesty to be so preserved and deposited, as that they may, all of them, securely remain permanent authentic documents and memorials of this accusation, and of the manner in which I met it; of my defence, as well as of the charge. That they may remain capable at any time, of being resorted to, if the malice which produced the charge originally, shall ever venture to renew it.

Beyond this, I am sure your Majesty will think it but proper and just, that I should be restored, in every respect, to the same situation, from whence the proceedings, under these false charges, have removed me. That, besides being graciously received again into the bosom of your Majesty's royal family, restored to my former respect and station amongst them, your Majesty will be graciously pleased, either to exert your influence with his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, that I may be restored to the use of my apartments in Carlton-house, which was reserved for me, except while the apartments were undergoing repair, till the date of these proceedings; or to assign to me some apartment in one of your royal palaces. Some apartment in or near to London is indispensably necessary for my convenient attendance at the drawing-room; and if I am not restored to that at Carlton-house, I trust your Majesty will graciously perceive how reasonable it is, that I should request that some apartment should be assigned to me suited to my dignity and situation, which may mark my reception and acknowledgment as one of your Majesty's family, and from which my attendance at the drawing-room may be easy and convenient.

If these measures are taken, I should hope that they would prove satisfactory to the public mind, and that I may feel myself fully restored in public estimation to my former character. And should they prove so satisfactory, I shall indeed be delighted to think, that no further step may, even now, appear to be necessary to my peace of mind, my security, and my honour.

But your Majesty will permit me to say, that if the next week, which will make more than a month from the time of your Majesty's informing me that you would receive me, should pass without my being received into your presence, and without having the assurance that these other requests of mine shall be complied with; I shall be under the painful necessity of consider-

ing them as refused. In which case I shall feel myself compelled, however reluctantly, to give the whole of these proceedings to the world,—unless your Majesty can suggest other adequate means of securing my honour and my life from the effect of the continuance or renewal of these proceedings, for the future as well as the present; for I entreat your Majesty to believe, that it is only in the absence of all other adequate means, that I can have resort to that measure. That I consider it with deep regret; that I regard it with serious apprehension, by no means so much on account of the effect it may have upon myself, as on account of the pain which it may give to your Majesty, your august family, and your loyal subjects.

As far as myself am concerned, I am aware of the observations to which this publication will expose me. But I am placed in a situation in which I have the choice only of two most unpleasant alternatives; and I am perfectly confident that the imputations and the loss of character which must, under these circumstances, follow from my silence, are most injurious and unavoidable; that my silence, under such circumstances, must lead inevitably to my utter infamy and ruin. The publication, on the other hand, will expose to the world nothing which is spoken to by any witness (whose infamy and discredit is not unanswerably exposed and established) which can, in the slightest degree, affect my character for honour, virtue, and delicacy.

There may be circumstances disclosed, manifesting a degree of condescension and familiarity in my behaviour and conduct, which, in the opinions of many, may be considered as not sufficiently guarded, dignified, and reserved. Circumstances, however, which my foreign education and foreign habits misled me to think, in the humble and retired situation in which it was my fate to live, and where I had no relation, no equal, no friend to advise me, were wholly free from offence. But when they have been dragged forward, from the scenes of private life, in a grave proceeding on a charge of high treason and adultery, they seem to derive a colour and character, from the nature of the charge which they are brought forward to support. And I cannot but believe that they have been used for no other purpose than to afford a cover, to screen from view the injustice of that charge; that they have been taken advantage of, to let down my accusers

more gently; and to deprive me of that full acquittal on the Report of the four Lords, which my innocence of all offence most justly entitled me to receive.

Whatever opinion, however, may be formed upon any part of my conduct, it must in justice be formed, with reference to the situation in which I was placed; if I am judged of as Princess of Wales, with reference to the high rank of that station, I must be judged as Princess of Wales, banished from the Prince, unprotected by the support and the countenance which belong to that station; and if I am judged of in my private character, as a married woman, I must be judged of as a wife banished from her husband, and living in a widowed seclusion from him, and retirement from the world. This last consideration leads me to recur to an expression in Mrs. Lisle's examination, which describes my conduct, in the frequency and the manner of my receiving the visits of Captain Manby, though always in the presence of my Ladies, as unbecoming a married woman. Upon the extreme injustice of setting up the *opinion* of one woman, as it were, in judgment upon the conduct of another; as well as of estimating the conduct of a person in my unfortunate situation, by reference to that which might, in general, be expected from a married woman, living happily with her husband, I have before generally remarked. But, beyond these general remarks in forming any estimate of my conduct, your Majesty will never forget the very peculiar circumstances and misfortunes of my situation. Your Majesty will remember that I had not been much above a year in this country, when I received the following letter from his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales:

"*Windsor Castle, April* 30, 1796.

"MADAM,—As Lord Cholmondeley informs me, that you wish I would define, in writing, the terms upon which we are to live, I shall endeavour to explain myself upon that head, with as much clearness, and with as much propriety, as the nature of the subject will admit. Our inclinations are not in our power, nor should either of us be held answerable to the other, because nature has not made us suitable to each other. Tranquil and comfortable society is, however, in our power; let our intercourse, therefore, be restricted to that, and I will distinctly subscribe to

the condition which you required, through Lady Cholmondeley, that even in the event of any accident happening to my daughter, which I trust Providence in its mercy will avert, I shall not infringe the terms of the restriction by proposing at any period a connection of a more particular nature. I shall now finally close this disagreeable correspondence, trusting that, as we have completely explained ourselves to each other, the rest of our lives will be passed in uninterrupted tranquillity.

" I am, Madam, with great truth, very sincerely your's,

" GEORGE P."

And that to this letter I sent the following answer:

" L'aveu de votre conversation avec Lord Cholmondeley, ne m'ètonne, ni ne m'offense. C'ètoitme confirmer, ce que vous m'avez tacitement insinuè depuis une année. Mais il y aurot apres cela, un manque de délicatesse ou, pour mieux dire, une bassesse indigne de me plaindre des conditions, que vous imposez a vous-même.

" Je ne vous aurois point fait de réponse, si votre lettre n'étoit conçue de manière á faire douter, si cet arrangement vient de vous, ou de moi; et vous sçavez que vous m'anonnaz l'honneur. La lettre que vous m'annoncez comme la derniere, m'oblige de communiquer au roi, comme à mon souverain, et à mon père, votre aveu et ma reponse. Vous trouverez çi-incluse la copie de celle que j'écris au roi. Je vous en préviens pour ne pas m'attirer de votre part la moindre reproch de duplicité. Comme je n'ai dans ce moment, d'autre protecteur que sa Majesté, je m'en rapporte uniquement à lui. Et si ma conduite merite son approbation, je serai, du moins en partie, consolée.

" Du reste, je conserve toute la reconnoissance possible de ce que je me trouve par votre moyen, comme Princesse de Galles, dans une situation à pouvoir me livrer sans contrainte, à une vertu chere à mon cœur, je veux dire la bienfaisance. Ce sera pour moi un devoir d'agir de plus par un autre motif, sçavoir celui de donner l'exemple de la patience, et de la résignation dans toutes sortes d'épreuves. Rendez-moi la justice de me croire, que je ne cesserai jamais de faire des vœux pour votre bonheur, et d'ètre votre bien dévouée.

Ce 6 *de Mai*, 1796." " CAROLINE."

The date of his Royal Highness's letter is the 30th of April, 1796. The date of our marriage, your Majesty will recollect, is the 8th day of April, in the year 1795, and that of the birth of our only child the 7th of January, 1796.

On the letter of his Royal Highness I offer no comment. I only entreat your Majesty not to understand me to introduce it, as affording any supposed justification or excuse for the least departure from the strictest line of virtue, or the slightest deviation from the most refined delicacy. The crime, which has been insinuated against me, would be equally criminal and detestable; the indelicacy imputed to me would be equally odious and abominable, whatever renunciation of conjugal authority and affection the above letter of his Royal Highness might, in any construction of it, be supposed to have conveyed. Such crimes and faults derive not their guilt from the consideration of the conjugal virtues of the individual, who may be the most injured by them, however much such virtues may aggravate their enormity. No such letter, therefore, in any construction of it, no renunciation of conjugal affection or duties, could ever palliate them. But whether conduct free from all crime, free from all indelicacy, (which I maintain to be the character of the conduct to which Mrs. Lisle's observations apply,) yet possibly not so measured as a cautious wife, careful to avoid the slightest appearance of not preferring her husband to all the world, might be studious to observe. Whether conduct of such description, and possibly, in such sense, not becoming a married woman, could be justly deemed, in my situation, an offence in me, I must leave to your Majesty to determine.

In making that determination, however, it will not escape your Majesty to consider, that the conduct which does or does not become a married woman, materially depends upon what is or is not known by her to be agreeable to her husband. His pleasure and happiness ought unquestionably to be her law; and his approbation the most favourite object of her pursuit. Different characters of men require different modes of conduct in their wives; but when a wife can no longer be capable of perceiving, from time to time, what is agreeable or offensive to her husband, when her conduct can no longer contribute to his happiness, no longer hope to be rewarded by his approbation, surely to examine

that conduct by the standard of what ought, in general, to be the conduct of a married woman, is altogether unreasonable and unjust.

What then is my case? Your Majesty will do me the justice to remark, that, in the above letter of the Prince of Wales, there is not the most distant surmise, that crime, that vice, that indelicacy of any description, gave occasion to his determination; and all the tales of infamy and discredit, which the inventive malice of my enemies has brought forward on these charges, have their date, years and years after the period to which I am now alluding. What then, let me repeat the question, is my case? After the receipt of the above letter, and in about two years from my arrival in this country, I had the misfortune entirely to lose the support, the countenance, the protection of my husband—I was banished, as it were, into a sort of humble retirement, at a distance from him, and almost estranged from the whole of the royal family. I had no means of having recourse, either for society or advice, to those from whom my inexperience could have best received the advantages of the one, and with whom I could, most becomingly, have enjoyed the comforts of the other; and if in this retired, unassisted, unprotected state, without the check of a husband's authority, without the benefit of his advice, without the comfort and support of the society of his family, a stranger to the habits and fashions of this country, I should in any instance, under the influence of foreign habits, and foreign education, have observed a conduct, in any degree deviating from the reserve and severity of British manners, and partaking of a condescension and familiarity which that reserve and severity would, perhaps, deem beneath the dignity of my exalted rank, I feel confident, (since such deviation will be seen to have been ever consistent with perfect innocence,) that not only your Majesty's candour and indulgence, but the candour and indulgence which, notwithstanding the reserve and severity of British manners, always belong to the British public, will never visit it with severity or censure.

It remains for me now to make some remarks upon the further contents of the paper, which was transmitted to me by the Lord Chancellor, on the 28th ult. And I cannot, in passing, omit to remark, that that paper has neither title, date, signature,

nor attestation; and unless the Lord Chancellor had accompanied it with a note, stating, that it was copied in his own hand from the original, which his Lordship had received from your Majesty, I should have been at a loss to have perceived any single mark of authenticity belonging to it; and as it is, I am wholly unable to discover what is the true character which does belong to it. It contains, indeed, the advice which your Majesty's servants have offered to your Majesty, and the message which, according to that advice, your Majesty directed to be delivered to me.

Considering it, therefore, wholly as their act, your Majesty will excuse and pardon me, if, deeply injured as I feel myself to have been by them, I express myself with freedom upon their conduct. I may speak, perhaps, with warmth, because I am provoked by a sense of gross injustice; I shall speak certainly with firmness and with courage, because I am emboldened by a sense of conscious innocence.

Your Majesty's confidential servants say, "they agree in the "opinions of the four lords," and they say this, "after the "fullest consideration of my observations, and of the affidavits "which were annexed to them." Some of these opinions, your Majesty will recollect, are, that "William Cole, Fanny Lloyd, "Robert Bidgood, and Mrs. Lisle, are witnesses who cannot," in the judgment of the four lords, "be suspected of any unfa-"vourable bias;" and "whose veracity, in this respect, they had "seen no ground to question;" and "that the circumstances to "which they speak, particularly as relating to Captain Manby, "must be credited until they are decisively contradicted." Am I then to understand your Majesty's confidential servants to mean, that they agree with the four noble Lords in these opinions? Am I to understand, that after having read, with the fullest consideration, the observations which I have offered to your Majesty; after having seen William Cole there proved to have submitted himself, five times at least, to private, unauthorized, voluntary examination by Sir John Douglas's solicitor, for the express purpose of confirming the statement of Lady Douglas, (of that Lady Douglas whose statement and deposition they are convinced to be so malicious and false, that they propose to institute such prosecution against her as your Majesty's law officers

may advise, upon a reference, now at length, after six months from the detection of that malice and falsehood, intended to be made)—after having seen this William Cole, submitting to such repeated voluntary examinations for such a purpose, and although he was all that time a servant on my establishment, and eating my bread, yet never once communicating to me that such examinations were going on—am I to understand, that your Majesty's confidential servants agree with the four Lords in thinking that he cannot, under such circumstances, *be suspected of unfavourable bias?* That after having had pointed out to them the direct flat contradiction between the same William Cole and Fanny Lloyd, they nevertheless agree to think them both (though in direct contradiction to each other, *yet both)* witnesses, *whose veracity they see no ground to question?* After having seen Fanny Lloyd directly and positively contradicted, in an assertion most injurious to my honour, by Mr. Mills and Mr. Edmeades, do they agree in opinion with the four noble Lords, that they see *no ground to question her veracity*?—After having read the observations on Mr. Bidgood's evidence; after having seen that he had the hardihood to swear that he believed Captain Manby slept in my house, at Southend, and to insinuate that he slept in my bed-room; after having seen that he founded himself on this most false fact, and most foul and wicked insinuation, upon the circumstance of observing a basin and some towels where he thought they ought not to be placed; after having seen that this fact, and this insinuation, were disproved before the four noble Lords themselves, by two maid-servants, who at that time, lived with me at Southend, and whose duties about my person and my apartments, must have made them acquainted with this fact, as asserted, or as insinuated, if it had happened; after having observed too, in confirmation of their testimony, that one of them mentioned the name of another female servant (who was not examined,) who had, from her situation, equal means of knowledge with themselves—I ask whether, after all this decisive weight of contradiction to Robert Bidgood's testimony, I am to understand your Majesty's confidential servants to agree with the four noble Lords in thinking that Mr. Bidgood is a witness who *cannot be suspected of unfavourable bias*, and that there is *no ground to question his veracity?* If, Sire, I were to go through

all the remarks of this description, which occur to me to make, I should be obliged to repeat nearly all my former observations, and to make this letter as long as my original answer; but to that answer I confidentially appeal, and I will venture to challenge your Majesty's confidential servants to find a single impartial and honourable man, unconnected in feeling and interest with the parties, and unconnected in council, with those who have already pledged themselves to an opinion upon this subject, who will lay his hand upon his heart, and say that these three witnesses, on whom that report so mainly relies, are not to be suspected of the grossest partiality, and that their veracity is not most fundamentally impeached.

Was it then noble, was it generous, was it manly, was it just, in your Majesty's confidential servants, instead of fairly admitting the injustice, which had been, inadvertently, and unintentionally, no donbt, done to me, by the four noble Lords in their report, upon the evidence of these witnesses, to state to your Majesty, that they agree with these noble Lords in their opinion, though they cannot, it seems, go the length of agreeing any longer to withhold the advice which restores me to your Majesty's presence? and with respect to the particulars to my prejudice, remarked upon in the report as those "which justly deserve the "most serious consideration, and which must be credited till de-"cisively contradicted," instead of fairly avowing, either that there was originally no pretence for such a remark, or that, if there had been originally, yet that my answer had given that decisive contradiction which was sufficient to discredit them; instead, I say, of acting this just, honest, and open part, to take no notice whatsoever of those contradictions, and content themselves with saying, that "none of the facts or allegations stated in preliminary examinations, carried on in the absence of the parties interested, could be considered as *legally* or *conclusively* established?"

They agree in the opinion that the facts or allegations, though stated in preliminary examinations, carried on in the absence of the parties interested, *must be credited till decisively contradicted, and deserve the most serious consideration.* They read, with the fullest consideration, the contradiction which I have tendered to them; they must have known, that no other sort of contradiction

could, by possibility, from the nature of things, have been offered upon such subjects; they do not question the truth, they do not point out the insufficiency of the contradiction, but in loose, general, indefinite terms, referring to my answer, consisting, as it does, of above two hundred written pages, and coupling it with those examinations (which they admit establish nothing against an absent party) they advise your Majesty, that "there appear "many circumstances of conduct, which could not be regarded "by your Majesty without serious concern;" and that, as to all the other facts and allegations, except those relative to my pregnancy and delivery, they are not to be considered as "*legally and conclusively established,*" because spoken to in preliminary examinations, not carried on in the presence of parties concerned. They do not, indeed, expressly assert, that my contradiction was not decisive or satisfactory; they do not expressly state, that they think the facts and allegations want nothing towards their legal and conclusive establishment, but a re-examination in the presence of the parties interested, but they go far to imply such opinions. That those opinions are utterly untenable, against the credit and character of those witnesses, I shall ever most confidently maintain; but that those observations leave their credit wholly unaffected, and did not deserve the least notice from your Majesty's servants, it is impossible that any honourable man can assert, or any fair and unprejudiced mind believe.

I now proceed, Sire, to observe, very shortly, upon the advice further given to your Majesty as contained in the remaining part of the paper; which has represented that, both in the examinations, and even in my answer there have appeared many circumstances of conduct which could not be regarded but with serious concern, and which have suggested the expression of a desire and expectation that such a conduct may in future be observed by me, as may fully justify these marks of paternal regard and affection, which your Majesty wishes to shew to all your Royal Family.

And here, Sire, your Majesty will graciously permit me to notice the hardship of the advice, which has suggested to your Majesty to convey to me this reproof. I complain not so much for what it does, as for what it does not contain: I mean the absence of all particular mention of what it is that is the object of

their blame. The circumstances of conduct, which appear in these examinations, and in my answer to which they allude as those which may be supposed to justify the advice, which has led to this reproof, since your Majesty's servants have not particularly mentioned them, I cannot be certain that I know. But I will venture confidently to repeat the assertion, which I have already made, that there are no circumstances of conduct, spoken to by any witness, (whose infamy and discredit are not unanswerably exposed, and established,) nor any where apparent in my answer which have the remotest approach either to crime, or to indelicacy.

For my future conduct, Sire, impressed with every sense of gratitude for all former kindness, I shall be bound, unquestionably, by sentiment as well as duty, to study your Majesty's pleasure. Any advice which your Majesty may wish to give to me in respect of any particulars of my conduct, I shall be bound, and be anxious to obey as my law. But I must trust that your Majesty will point out to me the particulars, which may happen to displease you, and which you may wish to have altered. I shall be as happy in thus feeling myself safe from blame under the benefit of your Majesty's advice, as I am now in finding myself secured from danger, under the protection of your justice.

Your Majesty will permit me to add one word more.

Your Majesty has seen what detriment my character has, for a time, sustained by the false and malicious statement of Lady Douglas, and by the depositions of the witnesses who were examined in support of her statement. Your Majesty has seen how many enemies I have, and how little their malice has been restrained by any regard to truth in the pursuit of my ruin. Few, as it may be hoped, may be the instances of such determined and unprovoked malignity, yet I cannot flatter myself that the world does not produce other persons, who may be swayed by similar motives to similar wickedness. Whether the statement to be prepared by the Prince of Wales is to be confined to the old charges, or is intended to bring forward new circumstances, I cannot tell; but if any fresh attempts of the same nature shall be made by my accusers, instructed as they will have been, by their miscarriage in this instance, I can hardly hope that they will not renew their charge, with an improved artifice,

more skilfully directed, and with a malice, inflamed rather than abated, by their previous disappointment. I therefore can only appeal to your Majesty's justice, in which I confidently trust, that whether these charges are to be renewed against me either on the old or on fresh evidence; or whether new accusations, as well as new witnesses, are to be brought forward, your Majesty, after the experience of these proceedings, will not suffer your royal mind to be prejudiced by *ex parte* secret examinations, nor my character to be whispered away by insinuations or suggestions, which I have no opportunity of meeting. If any charge, which the law will recognise, should be brought against me in an open and a legal manner, I should have no right to complain, nor any apprehension to meet it. But till I may have a full opportunity of so meeting it, I trust your Majesty will not suffer it to excite even a suspicion to my prejudice. I must claim the benefit of the presumption of innocence till I am proved to be guilty, for without that presumption, against the effects of secret insinuation and *ex parte* examinations, the purest innocence can make no defence, and can have no security.

Surrounded, as it is now proved that I have been for years, by domestic spies, your Majesty must, I trust, feel convinced, that if I had been guilty, there could not have been wanting evidence to have proved my guilt. And, that these spies have been obliged to have resort to their own invention for the support of the charge, is the strongest demonstration that the truth, undisguised, and correctly represented could furnish them with no handle against me. And when I consider the nature and malignity of that conspiracy, which I feel confident I have completely detected and exposed, I cannot but think of that detection with the liveliest gratitude as the special blessing of Providence, who, by confounding the machinations of my enemies, has enabled me to find, in the excess and extravagance of their malice, in the very weapons, which they fabricated and sharpened for my destruction, the sufficient guard to my innocence, and the effectual means of my justification and defence.

I trust therefore, Sire, that I may now close this long letter, in confidence that many days will not elapse before I shall receive from your Majesty that assurance that my just requests may be so completely granted, as may render it possible for me (which

nothing else can) to avoid the painful disclosure to the world of all the circumstances of that injustice, and of those unmerited sufferings, which these proceedings, in the manner in which they have been conducted, have brought upon me.

I remain, Sire,
With every sentiment of gratitude,
Your Majesty's most dutiful,
Most submissive Daughter-in-law,
Subject and Servant,
(Signed) C. P.

Montague-house, February 16, 1807.

As these observations apply not only to the official communication through the Lord Chancellor, of the 28th ult.; but also to the private letter of your Majesty on the 12th instant, I have thought it most respectful to your Majesty and your Majesty's Servants to send this letter in duplicate, one part through Colonel Taylor, and the other through the Lord Chancellor, to your Majesty.

To the King. (Signed) C. P.

APPENDIX.

No. II.

Official and other Documents in Support of the Defence of Her Majesty, to the Charges brought against her in 1820, *and which arrived too late to be tendered as Evidence before the House of Lords.*

Documents, &c. demonstrating that Her Majesty's Conduct in Italy was not such as to bear out the Preamble of the Bill of Pains and Penalties, or to bring great Scandal and Dishonour upon His Majesty's Family and this Kingdom.

(No. I.)

ANDREA DE CONTI MASTAI FERRETTI, Patrician of Sinigaglia and of Ancona, by the grace of God and of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Pesaro, Domestic Chaplain to His Holiness the Pope, and Assistant in the holy labours of the Pontifical Throne:

At the request of her Majesty the Queen of England, we do hereby, to whomsoever it may concern, certify and attest, that during the stay made by her Majesty, in Pesaro and its adjacent dependencies, for the space of ***nearly three years***, there was never the slightest report spread that could be injurious to the honour of her Majesty; it being, on the contrary, always well known, that at the entertainments, the festas, and conversaziones, which were given by her Majesty, or which she condescended to appear at, her Majesty always preserved that dignified deportment which is inherent in a person of her august birth and high rank; which, however, was still mingled with the utmost courtesy, politeness, and urbanity.

We further certify, that in the fulfilment of our pastoral duty, we continually receive *secret* notices of the conduct of individuals living in our dioceses, but that we have received none of this individual that could give us reason to suspect the decency of her Majesty the Queen of England; nor can we doubt, that had there really occurred any scandal, it certainly could not have remained concealed from the vigilance of our Court. Therefore, for the triumph of truth, and for the complete justification of the

unspotted character of her Majesty, we have made no difficulty in delivering and signing the present certificate, and causing our seal to be thereunto affixed.

Given in Pesaro, at our Episcopal Residence, this 26th of August 1820.

ANDREA, Bishop.
GAETANO COSTANTININI, Secretary.

(No. II.)

PONTIFICAL STATE.

In the name of God, Amen; in the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty, his Holiness Pope Pius the Seventh happily reigning, on Saturday the twelfth of August:

Before me, the undersigned Notary and Witnesses personally appeared the HONOURABLE PAOLO LANZI, son of the late Carlo, sixty years of age, a native of Reggio of Modena, resident in Ancona, Aid-major of Place, of the said city, a person to me well known, who upon his corporal oath by him taken on the Holy Evangelists, and to him by me duly administered, said and declared as real truth, as follows, *viz.*

That in the months of May or June, or thereabout, in the year 1817, to the best of his recollection, the time when her Majesty the Queen of England, then Princess of Wales, came to reside in this city, he the deponent was invited and directed by his most Reverend Excellency Monsigneur Lodovico Gazzoli, Apostolic Delegate, to be introduced to her Royal Highness in order to pay her his humble respects. Afterwards the deponent was commanded by the Government to accompany her as far as Rome, being further authorized by the said Government to remain near her person, and to accompany her at her return. During that journey, as well as on her return, which was done by short stages, her Majesty was under the necessity of stopping and passing the night at country inns, where she certainly was deprived of the necessary accommodations which would have been requisite for lodging a person of so much distinction; nevertheless, and notwithstanding the imperious necessity of such cir-

cumstances, and that degree of liberty which is allowed when living in the country, he, the deponent, could not but observe and admire the dignified deportment which constantly marked the conduct of her Majesty towards all the persons in her retinue, without any one amongst them ever having taken the liberty of assuming the least familiarity, which would be incompatible with those marks of respect, which he observed at all times paid to her by all. He further observed that, particularly her first Chamberlain, Signior Baron Pergami, was the person who was the first in keeping within the limits of the greatest submission; so much so, that during the said journey, as well as during the residence of her Royal Highness at Rome, and at her return, when he offered his arm to her that her Majesty might lean upon it, the act was always preceded by a respectful inclination agreeable to that strict etiquette which is adopted towards a royal personage.

That to the dignified deportment of Majesty, she united singular instances of affability and kindness, and that in consequence of her extreme goodness, her Royal Highness condescended to converse with the deponent on matters relative to the situation in which she had been placed for some years past; and he well remembers that her Majesty on such occasions would discourse with him in regard to her retinue being entirely composed by Italians, whom she had preferred to be about her person; and he particularly remembers that she represented to him, that it was an absolute necessity which had induced her to act in that manner for the following reasons:

1st. Because if she had formed for herself a suite consisting merely of English persons, either that would have prevented her passing her days in tranquillity, or it would have caused the ruin of those English families of which the individuals might have attached themselves to her establishment.

2d. Because having made choice for her service of some resolute Italians, all of them military men, she thereby could depend upon their personal courage to protect her against the treacherous attacks with which she conceived herself to be threatened.

Those discourses took place between her Majesty and the deponent during the three last years passed, at which time her

Majesty certainly could not foresee that she should one day be under the necessity of making a judicial use thereof.

After her Majesty returned from Rome, he, the deponent, had several occasions to present his respects and pay his court to her Majesty at Pesaro, Sinigaglia, to be present at dinner parties, conversaziones, the theatre, and balls; on which occasions, he the deponent could not but remark and admire the same dignified deportment, to which he has already alluded, and the same submission and respect shown on the part of all the individuals belonging to her retinue; so that instead of its being possible to suspect the least predilection or familiarity on her part, he could not but be in the highest degree edified with the high decency and dignity of deportment shown on all occasions by her Majesty.

All which circumstances being fully within the knowledge of the deponent, he has hereby, at the request of her Majesty, made this present declaration, which upon his honor and conscience he avers to be the truth.

Done, past, read, and published in this legal manner at Ancona in the office of me the undersigned Notary, Out Porta-Farina, at Catastale, No. 3, in presence of the undersigned witnesses thereto competent and requested.

(Signed) Capt. Lieut. Paolo Lanzi, Aid-Major of the Place of Ancona, attesting and deposing as above.

(*Signed*) Cesare Postio, witness.

(*Signed*) Lodovico Alessandrini, witness in testimony of the truth.

(Signed) Giuseppe Sertory, son of the late Paolo, Paolo, Public Notary, resident in Ancona, requested.

Registered at Ancona the 14th August, 1820, at fo. 38 division 4 of the registrar, under the number 14 of civil acts; written upon six pages and received 20 bajocchi.

(Stamp.)

The Prefect,

(*Signed*) A. Cherubini.

(Stamp.)

We do hereby certify that the preceding signature and firm of office is that of Giuseppe Sertorj.—At the House of the Civil Tribunal of First Resort, at Ancona this fourteenth (14) August, 1820.

The President,

(*Signed*) Gio Ballad Marchesini. (L. S.)

We, the Chancellor of the Vice Consulate of France, at Ancona, do hereby certify and attest to whom it may or shall concern, that the hereto annexed signature, is that of Marchesini, President of the Civil Tribunal of this City, and that faith may be given thereto, both in and out of all courts of judicature.

In testimony whereof, we have signed these presents and thereto affixed the royal seal of the Consulate.

Done in the Chancery, at Ancona, the 14th August, 1820.

(*Signed*) The Chancellor of the Vice-Consulate,

(L. S.) Ruffini.

(No. III.)

To Her Majesty.

I take this opportunity to submit to your Majesty the present sincere expressions of my profound respect; and since circumstances* have not permitted me to accept the invitation your Majesty most graciously honoured me with, I wish at least to assure your Majesty that it occasioned me sincere grief, and that it would have been the height of my ambition to have contributed, by my presence, towards an object so nearly interesting your Majesty.

Certainly your Majesty having deigned to allow me to attend your Court, both in Pesaro and in Rome, I should have been more able than any other to have done justice to those eminent virtues which I have admired in your Majesty, and I should have been able to testify that, in the various occasions that I have had the good fortune to approach your Majesty, you have been always

* His rank as a Cardinal, which would not permit him to be examined before the House of Lords, was the sole difficulty. Ed.

surrounded by the most select society; and that your discourse, your manners and deportment, all have corresponded, and been such as became a personage of your exalted rank. But all this; which my circumstances so unfortunately prevent my attesting, I am certain can be done by so many many other Italian gentlemen, distinguished by their birth, merit and probity, who will immediately came forward; and under the painful necessity which I am in of depriving myself of the honour of serving your Majesty personally, I shall feel some consolation in knowing that my part has been well supplied by the above gentlemen, and that all has redounded to your Majesty's greater consideration in the world and higher glory. Such are the vows I form from the high opinion which I have conceived of your Majesty's incomparable merit, and with these I shall conclude, having the honour to subscribe myself, penetrated with the most devout respect, and most profound veneration,

Your Majesty's
Most humble, most devoted,
Most obliged Servant,
GIUSEPPE, CARDINAL ALBANI.

Rome, 13*th August*, 1820.

(No. IV.)

THE Gonfalonier* of the City of Pesaro, ANTALDO, Marquis Antaldi, declares to all who may be concerned in making legal inquiries into the conduct of her Royal Highness the Princess Caroline of Brunswick, Princess of Wales, that during the fifteen months since her Royal Highness has honoured the neighbourhood of this city by her residence in it, he has very frequently had the high honour of approaching her Royal Highness, when she has condescended to honour with her presence the public representations of this city; and he asserts and affirms, that she has preserved, and does preserve, towards the Chevalier Bartolomeo Pergami, Baron of Franchina, her Head Chamberlain,

* That is the head of the Municipality. ED.

such a behaviour as is suitable to her high rank, and that, however much she may regard him as the most faithful of her servants, he has not, on that account, observed, that she has descended to any familiarity which was at all inconsistent with the dignity of her station.

Declares, moreover, that he makes the present statement in obedience only to the truth, and for the purpose of rendering vain the calumnies which the malevolent have propagated respecting Her Royal Highness, and he is ready to ratify all this as a Judge, and even abroad by oath.

Given at Pesaro, at the public residence, the 18th November, 1818.

The Gonfalonier,

(L. S.) ANTALDI.

(No. V.)

Pesaro, this 2nd September, 1820.

APPEARED personally before me this day, and likewise before the undersigned witnesses, IL SIGNOR CAVALIERE CAMILLO SERONI, Captain and Adjutant of the fortress of Pesaro, to me well known, who voluntarily hath deposed, and does depose, as follows:—

That having been invited, by a most gracious message from her Majesty, the Queen of England, dated the 8th July, to appear in London, for the purpose of answering such interrogatories as might be addressed to him respecting this highly esteemed Lady, but not being permitted by the Pontifical Government (to which he is bound to pay all due respect) to absent himself from his command, he will endeavour to supply the want of his personal appearance in the best manner possible, by rendering sincere homage to truth, and to this purpose he deposes.

That by virtue of his office he visited every day, and sometimes more than once, the Picket Guard* of troops of the line, and that of Pontifical Carabiniers, situated at the villa where re-

* This guard was placed at the desire of the Princess, in consequence of her apprehensions of personal safety. Ed.

sided Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, and that he never had occasion to suspect that any acts of gallantry passed between her Majesty and her first Chamberlain, Baron Pergami, but that he had observed that he preserved towards her the most decent deportment, and such as was due to her Majesty's exalted rank.

He further deposes and attests, that the instructions received by the captain of this post were, that with regard to that part of their duty which concerned the Queen, they were to receive the necessary orders from her first Chamberlain, and he well knows, by the reports of the said captain, that at the evening the Chamberlain gave the watch-word; *so that if an express courier, or any kind of news arrived, the same captain, notwithstanding that he watched always in company with some one servant of the court, had orders to go straight to the chamber of the said Baron Pergami and wake him; and, from other reports, he knows this to have happened more than once, and that they have always found the said first Chamberlain sleeping in his own room, and that they have awakened him to communicate to him the business for which they had entered.*

(Properly signed and authenticated.)

(No. VI.)

Milan, August 29, 1820.

CHEVALIER BARON GIUSSEPPE CAVALETTI, son of WENCESILAUS, native of Cremona, inhabitant of Milan, Landholder.

From the time of the Princess of Wales' arrival in this state, he has had the honour of freqnently visiting her, from October 1815, till her departure for Villa d'Este, near Como. All the time she remained at Villa d'Este, before her journey to Egypt and afterwards, and whilst she was at the Barona, near Milan, he always had the honour of visiting her; and once her Royal Highness honoured with her presence his paternal Villa of Montiellô, situated at Monte di Brianza.

He can truly declare, that never on these occasions did he observe any act towards any person that could degrade her in his esteem, or contrary to the dignity of her character and rank.

Nay, it was his constant idea that she insisted on nobody's *using any equivocal expressions*, or acts, or freedoms, which could seem in the least improper, and derogatory to that etiquette which ought to be observed in the presence of a Princess of her rank.

The Princess behaved with a most decent affability towards Signior Pergami, but within the limits which became her character and rank, and such affability as the most scrupulous honour would allow a Princess to observe towards a dependent *who had saved her life;* witness himself being present when, upon information of a person having got into the kitchen at Villa d'Este on the fête of St. Carlo with wicked intentions, Signior Pergami courageously seized him and gave him in custody to the police at Como; and witness also knowing that the person thus seized and attempted to corrupt Moritz, the chief person of Her Royal Highness's stables, in order to obtain the keys of her apartment with the intention of counterfeiting them. The Princess having secretly learnt the plot, dismissed Moritz, who, interrogated by witness, repented, and confessed to him the attempt made to corrupt him, putting it in writing in the most detailed manner before the then pensioned Ex-prefect of Como, Tomassia; confessing that he had been seduced by money given him by the person who was let into the kitchen, and who had been sent by one Signior Ompteda, an Hanoverian, who at different times caused money to be given him, though he does not know the quantity. For this reason it is not wonderful if she treated with some distinction Signior Pergami, to whose courage she confided her existence.

(Signed, &c.)

(No. VII.)

Cernobio, August 5, 1820.

Required to declare the sincere truth, I the undersigned hereby certify, that being several times admitted to the honour of the society of her present Majesty the Queen of England, during her stay at the Villa d'Este, a district of my parish, I have had occasion to observe that Her Majesty has always behaved

with the greatest decorum and exemplary delicacy, as became her high station.

I further bear witness to her having most generously bestowed alms on the poor of my parish, and to her having left public monuments of her benevolence, which are held here in eternal remembrance.

P. Gio^e^. M^a^. Ostinelli, Priest.

The Imperial Royal and Cesarian Office of the second district of Como, August 5, 1820.

The above declaration of the Priest Gio. Ma. Ostinelli, present Curate of Cernobio, was made in my presence at the above office on the aforesaid day.

Pasquali, G. R. Como.

(No. VIII.)

Como, this 19th August 1819.

I, the undersigned, hereby attest that during a journey which I made in Germany, I became known to the Princess Caroline, since, wife of the Prince of Wales, now King of England; and that I afterwards visited Her Royal Highness the said Princess of Wales, now Queen, during her stay of several months, now about two years ago, in the suburbs of Como, my country.

In all this time, and on all other occasions which were very frequent; visiting her sometimes in the morning, in her boudoir, sometimes at her conversazione in the evening; at other times accompanying her in her walks, and often sitting by her side at dinner, I always observed united in her, the most gracious affability and the most noble decorum, and indeed, such as often to be noticed to me by the various other noble and distinguished personages, who more or less, frequently came to offer her their respects and enjoy the honour of her society.

(*Signed*) Count Alessandro Volta.*

* Medical professor, seventy years of age.

Ed.

(No. IX.)

Como, from the Colleggio Gallio, 26th *August,* 1820.

I the undersigned, hereby attest that every time that I had occasion to attend on the Princess of Wales, in her Villa of Cenobbio, to give an account of the progress of any of the youths maintained by her in the Colleggio Gallio, I always returned edified by the solicitude she expressed for their progress in every thing, but particularly in their morals.

I further attest to have seen her strike out with a pencil in a French comedy of Regnard, all those places which scarcely could be considered likely to offend the strictest modesty, in order to their exclusion at the rehearsals at her palace, and which they actually were.

Finally, I attest to have always seen in her Royal Highness, a dignified and princely reserve, which conciliated towards her a general and profound esteem.

(*Signed*) The Priest GIUSEPPE PAGANI, Vice-Rector and Professor, for thirty-four years, of eloquence, and of the Greek language, in the above College.

(No. X.)

In the course of the numerous times that I was honoured by admittance to the conversazione of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales Brunswick, at present Queen of England, and on the several occasions on which I was witness to her appearance in public, which were frequent, I could not but admire the noble and decorous reserve constantly practised by her Royal Highness, being invariably such as was proper for a person of her illustrious birth.

At the same time should I attempt to enumerate the various acts of beneficence, and the noble charities performed by her, the task would prove too difficult; but I shall consider myself licensed to testify the existence of the highest degree of grati-

tude felt towards her by this population, which will never cease to bless her name, and implore from the Most High, all happiness and felicity, upon her exalted head.

Como, this 18th *August*, 1820.

(*Signed*) DON ANTONIO GUAITA, Freeholder, (Possedente) and noble Deputy of the Province.

(No. XI.)

Pesaro, 31st *August*, 1820.

In the name of God, Amen; I, the undersigned FRANCESCO, son of the late COUNT GAETANO BELLUZZI, Patrician of Pesaro, and Knight of the Order of Jerusalem, having been invited by her Majesty, Caroline Queen of England, by her Royal dispatch of the 8th of July, to appear in London, there to answer the interrogatories which might be put to me relating to the conduct of her Majesty with respect to the Baron Pergami, formerly her first Chamberlain; but not being able from my weak constitution, and from the cares necessary to my numerous infant family, to expose myself to so long a journey; I will, in the best manner possible, render public my sentiments on such a proposal, and for the furtherance of truth and justice I depose as follows.

First. To have never seen, or heard from any upright person, who has seen her Majesty, Caroline Queen of England, then Princess of Wales, in the two years and a half of her residence in this city, use any demeanor before her first Chamberlain Bartholemew Pergami, which could cause any suspicion of a guilty correspondence; but on the contrary to have observed and heard it observed by others, that her much esteemed Majesty, spoke with the above named Pergami, with that superiority corresponding to her royal education.

Secondly. I declare to have never seen, or heard that others had seen, that the above named Baron Pergami ever appeared to use too much familiarity towards her Majesty, or in a manner to cause suspicion, that there passed between them any guilty correspondence, and that he either in public or in private ever boasted of the secret favours of her Majesty; I also attest to

have observed, and to have heard others observe, that the said Baron Pergami used with her Majesty all that respect due to her rank, and when speaking of her august person, both with me, and with other upright persons, he spoke of her with all due veneration. (Signed, &c.)

(No. XII.)

Ancona, 15th *Oct.* 1820.

We, the undersigned, for the pure truth, under tender of oath, declare, that when her Majesty, the Queen of England, came to lodge for some days in the palace of his Royal Highness the PRINCE EUGENE, Duke of Leuchtenberg, and Prince of Eichstett, the bed-room where her Majesty reposed was made up with one bed alone; the two beds which are there now, and were also there before, having been removed, because they were intended for the use of the PRINCE EUGENE and his consort; whereas her Majesty sleeping alone, the beds then there were too small, and she could not use both.

We also certify, that the room which was intended for the occupation of the Signor Pergami, her first Chamberlain, was at the distance of three rooms on one side, and of a corridor and three rooms on the other; because her Majesty slept on the side overlooking the sea, and the Baron in a room which looks upon the yard, so that to come from the one to the other of these bed-rooms, it was necessary that if the Baron went out on the right hand side of his room, he must have passed through a very spacious saloon and through another room, to get into the bed-room of her Majesty; and if he went out on the left hand side, he must have passed through a corridor, then a saloon, then another large room, and afterwards a cabinet.

From all which it is clear, that seeing the distance from one to the other, and the different apartments which were between them, it was impossible that either, from their own room, would venture to make such a round, as the above specified, to see the other.

To the truth of which we have deposed under our own hand.

LEOPOLD BENDONI, Agent of his Royal Highness the Prince Duke of Leuchtenberg.

MARIA ANNA VILLI BENDONI.

(No. XIII.)

Pesaro, 2nd *Nov.* 1820.

I, the undersigned, do hereby depose, that about three years ago, the Princess of Wales, now Queen of England, came to reside at the palace of the Villa Caprile, in the environs of this city, belonging to my family, where not only I had the honour of being presented to her Majesty, but also of being particularly distinguished by her; so much so, that I was honoured by issuing the invitations for all the distinguished personages, who also through me were introduced, and who appeared at all the entertainments, which on various occasions were given by her Majesty. The anniversaries of San Carlo, name-day of her Majesty, and of St. George, were the days on which the most numerous companies were assembled, and were the most brilliant in point of preparation; and as well on these occasions as on all others, (I allude to her more retired circles), I have always had reason to admire in her Majesty that really dignified reserve, so justly expected in a person of her rank.

This decorum was preserved with all the persons of her court without any exception; and also in the course of her journies, having had the honour to accompany her Majesty in her own carriage three different times for short journies, such as to Rimini and to Sinigaglia, at the time of the fair.

Her Chamberlain, Mr. Pergami, who by the duties of his office must be near her person, never approached her without the accustomed etiquette in other sovereign courts, and always conducted himself with the strictest observance of the utmost respect.

And to the solemn truth of the above, I here depose:

BARBARA, Marchioness MOSCA PUSSIONEJ,
born Countess ANGUISSOLA.

No. XIV.

Ancona, 21st August, 1820.

Appeared personally before me Notary, and in the presence of the undersigned witnesses, Cavalier JAMES MOLINARI, native of Pesaro, residing in Ancona, commanding the 3d Corps of the Financial Troops, to me well known, who does upon oath, and making the sign of the cross, depose as follows:

"That being at Pesaro, about two years back, when the Queen of England, then Princess of Wales, was residing there, the deponent had the honour of being presented to her, and thus often paid his respects, and was frequently invited by her Majesty to dinner, and likewise to conversaziones and entertainments; and on such occasions, he had a full opportunity of observing that her Majesty, to the utmost courteousness, with which she received every one of the numerous personages who had the honour of being presented to her, united the greatest dignity of demeanor, such as became her illustrious birth, and high rank, without the deponent having been able to see that her Majesty used any familiarity with any person of her suite, all of whom she equally treated with her accustomed affability, without, however, the least shadow of descending from her usual reserve (*contegno*).

He can also faithfully assert to have several times seen the Baron Pergami (her first Chamberlain) escort her Majesty, being on horseback, and near the carriage door, at a time when her Majesty considered herself far from secure, having heard that some of her enemies had come on to Pesaro.

As the deponent has been expressly desired by her Majesty's agent to declare on his oath whether he ever perceived any action which could bring scandal upon morals.* On this head he can safely declare never to have noticed any action inconsistent with the most rigid moral uprightness. He declares, likewise, to have had several opportunities of associating with the Baron Pergami, whom he has often accompanied to the chace. He declares to have always observed, that this person always treated her Majesty with the respect and etiquette due to

* Here might be quoted the words of the Bill, but preference is given to the very literal meaning, which has been hitherto adhered to. Ed.

her; and that whenever he, the deponent, went, howeve rearly in the morning, to fetch the Baron to hunting, he always found him in his own bed, and that in his own private room, which the Baron always occupied at the Villa, and this he has likewise noticed when he, the deponent, slept at the Villa any night previous to their being engaged to hunt.

(Signed and attested, &c.)

No. XV.

Pesaro, this day, 26th August, 1820.

I the undersigned, by the present attestation, affirm and declare, to whomever it shall concern, and do for the love of truth by my oath and sacred word as a gentleman maintain, that having been very many times admitted to the honour of dining and being in the society of her Majesty Caroline, Queen of England, during the time of her residence in this our city of Pesaro, I have always recognized in her, and duly respected her for that dignified reserve which distinguishes personages whose birth and education fit them for reigning. And I considered this in her Majesty as the more grand and decorous, as that with affable and agreeable manners she tried to soften the austerity, and lessen the immense distance between a reigning personage, and the subjects who approach them. So that I always perceived that her Majesty had acquired the difficult art of captivating the respect and veneration of all with her noble manners, which appeared exerted by her solely for the purposes of benevolence, and inspiring the members of her society with self-confidence, an artifice wholly useless if taught by policy, but in her a most admirable prerogative, as it sprung from the excellence of her heart, and realgreatness of her disposition. And I always saw that she used the same courteous authority towards her dependants, amongst whom, and the first of them, was the Baron Pergami, who managed the affairs of her household, and he, wirh the rest of them, returned it with respectful submission, and with the most scrupulous attention to their duties; so that, whatever I observed in her conduct never made me have the least suspicion, or imagine

that her Majesty *could* abase herself by improper familiarity, nor that her Chamberlain could take advantage of the office he was invested with, which naturally gave him more frequent opportunities than the rest of the household of approaching her sacred person.

And all these things I can positively speak to, because I was an absolute eye-witness of them, and in declaring them in this attestation, I intend to affirm them from my own personal knowledge, in order to render homage to truth and to justice, because in case this declaration should not be considered sufficiently valid, I protest and declare myself to be ready to confirm it in person, before any tribunal that might be sent here for that purpose, since, for insurmountable reasons,* I cannot go myself to London.

(*Signed*) COUNT ODOARDO MACHIRELLI.

* His mother being in her 80th year, and in an infirm and sickly state. Ed.

No. XVI.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE ROYAL CITY OF COMO, 22d August 1820, has the honour to certify, that her Majesty the Queen of England has given distinct proofs of an excellent and dignified conduct during her residence in this royal city, and at the Villa d'Este in the Commune of Cenobbio. The generous and beneficent traits of the character of her said Majesty towards the poor families of the said Commune, with the gifts of considerable sums of money to the parish of Cenobbio, attest the praiseworthy feelings of her morality, goodness, and beneficence. This Municipality also certifies, that her Majesty the Queen was visited by persons of distinction at her conversaziones, and that when she appeared in public, she exacted, by her dignified conduct, that respect which was due to so illustrious a personage. The Municipality further attests, that on the occasion of a fire having taken place in the said city of Como, her Majesty expressed the most lively interest to know the families who had suffered, and were worthy of assistance, which was immediately afforded by her.

(Signed, &c. with the usual formalities of authenticity.)

No. XVII.

The undersigned TOMMASO FELICI, Judge of the Tribunal of Pesaro, and Counsellor to the Court of Appeal in Bologna and the "Sacra Rota" in Rome; and TERESA, wife to the above, would have been ready to have presented themselves as witnesses, according to the royal dispatch of the 8th July 1820, on the trial of her Majesty the Queen of England before the Parliament, if, on their arrival in London on the 9th of November, the proceedings had not been already closed. But since the delay necessary for providing themselves with a passport, which was only granted to them in the month of October by the Pontifical Government, has prevented them, they have endeavoured, in the most clear and legal manner, to declare the truth in writing.

They, therefore, declare themselves to be ready to ratify, in the most solemn manner, the following attestation: That they had the honour of being received by the then Princess of Wales, during the stay made by her in Pesaro, for nearly three years; and, on every occasion, they had the opportunity to observe the very dignified principles and morals which formed the character of the aforesaid Princess, who, towards the numerous persons who had the honour to visit her, and towards the gentlemen of her court, always preserved that deportment demanded by her high rank; not allowing any free conversation, and anxious for the decorous behaviour of their wives, upon whose good conduct she considered their mutual felicity depended. That having been repeatedly with her Majesty to the theatre, at balls, and walking parties, and at various entertainments, she always conducted herself with the utmost decency, and attracted the love and admiration of all around her. That her maternal affection was as conspicuous as her other virtues; for when death deprived her of her daughter, and took from England its dearest hope, she remained in this afflicting season long without comfort, or without seeing any of those persons who might, from their sympathy with her, have diverted her mind from that dreadful depression, which at last injured her health, from the

first very much affected. That the deponents having repeatedly gone to the villas Caprile and Vittoria, where she lived, without giving previous notice, they never had occasion to observe the least indecorum. That being honoured on the 1st of June, 1819, by the presence of her Royal Highness at a small country-house of their own, with some gentlemen and ladies, whom they invited to attend upon her during the whole of the day that she remained there, she clearly shewed how very particular she was in her conduct, and that no one gentleman presumed upon the least familiarity; that before she quitted the place, she distributed much in charity. That having known and been acquainted with the Baron Pergami, her chamberlain, they always remarked in him the most repectful deference, and they have repeatedly heard him call her benefactress; as likewise she had repeatedly declared to them, that her benefactions were intended as a recompense to that individual for his fidelity; he never having hesitated for her safety to expose himself to most imminent danger. That, in short, from the various things they had frequent opportunities both of hearing and seeing, they should never have had the most distant suspicion of indecorum or immorality in the Princess, whose affable, beneficent, and dignified manners had rendered her an object of sincere admiration, gratitude, and esteem.

(Signed) TERISA FELICE.
TOMMASO FELICE.

(No. XVIII.)

London, 27th January, 1820.

I, the undersigned, declare the following things, and am ready to maintain them on oath to whoever requires it.

Several times in the course of the year 1818, I was consulted by letter, and called from Bologna to Pesaro, on account of the health of her Majesty, then Princess of Wales. But in October of that year, according to the request of the courier who came to me at Parma, I went with all haste to the Villa Vittoria, her Majesty being attacked by a violent jaundice, with serious affec-

tion of the liver and stomach; and there I remained for some time, as well because it was an illness that required long attendance, as because the autumnal vacation permitted my remaining absent.

In such circumstances I had occasion to be for entire days, and sometimes part of the night, with her Majesty. Admitted, by the nature of my office into the interior of her Majesty's apartments, and honoured with her confidence, I was able to perceive that which by an occasional visitor could neither be well known, and never sufficiently appreciated. And I can well affirm for the sake of truth that never have I seen in her manners any thing, not only that was not decent and correct, but that was not really dignified, and such as became her rank. With the persons of her court, whose offices attached them most to her person, I have always seen her preserve that decorum which without varying from that goodness which is natural to her, respected the bounds prescribed to her by her high rank. To her inferiors, her Majesty certainly was more condescending than, unfortunately, is usual to those moving in so high a sphere; and I have seen her Majesty, though scarcely recovered, go down and visit the lowest of her domestics, herself causing the medicines so to be administered, and attending to see that every, the smallest assistance possible, was rendered to them; but if this condescension did not become a royal personage, and in fact constitute its principal ornament, I think that her Majesty would renounce the best privilege of her rank; so natural to her is benevolence and mildness towards her inferiors, and so irresistible to her feelings the wish to see all happy about her!

With respect to the persons with whom her Majesty liked to associate principally, they were chiefly persons the most distinguished in the country, both in point of rank and profession; and every individual, without exception, throughout her house, during her illness, shewed the most indefatigable attention to her, added to veneration and respect.

(Signed) GIACOMO TOMMASINI, Clinical Professor of Medicine in the University of Bologna, and one of the Forty Members of the Italian Academy (*della Societa Italiana delle Scienze.*)

Documents, &c. proving that the Birth, moral Character, Conduct and Connections of BARON PERGAMI, *with whom solely this licentious and adulterous Intercourse was charged to have taken place, were not of such a nature as to warrant the Inferences drawn from his Advancement to the office of Head of her Majesty's Household, &c.*

(No. I.)

Milan, August 30, 1820.

DEPOSITION of ANTONIO MONTFERINI, son of the late Giuseppe Antonio, native of Asago, province of Milan, domicilated at Pesaro; fifty-five years of age; married; nine children; a gentleman and landholder (*possidente;*) catholic. Admonished previously that he had nothing to expect from his deposition, says, that about fourteen or fifteen years since he was in possession of an estate on lease, which belonged to Count ANGELO SERPONTE, but now is the property of the heir of one ADAMO CRAMER, of Milan; the name of the estate is *Cascina delle Donne*, and is situate in the province of Lodi. At the time witness possessed the estate, PIETRO PERGAMI, of Crema (the father of the Baron,) purchased from one FRANCESCO SORDI, at Cuvoaga, in the province of Lodi, 600 perticas of land for the sum of 45,000 livres of Milan, with the houses upon it; but the mansion was near to the land that witness held on lease above mentioned, and this land joined, and was called the Dosso del Rovere. On this occasion PIETRO PERGAMI the father, with his wife Donna* LIVIA FORESTE, came from time to time to this new purchase, by which means the witness became acquainted with them; and when they had sold another estate that they had at Cremasco, they came to live at Dosso del Rovere, when the witness visited them, and learnt from various persons acquainted with the family that it was one of the wealthiest and most respectable of Crema, anciently possessing very considerable estates; but owing to a

*The term Donna is one of Nobility. Ed.

tripartite division of the possessions among the members of the family, the portion of PIETRO PERGAMI was much diminished. The father at his death was much indebted; he left five children two sons, Bartolomeo and Luigi; three daughters, Angiolini (the Countess of Oldi), wife of Count Oldi of Crema; the other, named Theresa, married one Signor Severgnini of Crema; the third, Faustina, married Signor Lorenzo Martini, of a good family of Lodi.

The family of Pietro Pergami, i. e. Bartolomeo Pergami, and his brothers and sisters above-mentioned, were obliged, on account of the father's debts, to sell the estate il Dosso del Rovere, part of which was purchased by the Countess Pino, and the other part by Signor Adamo Kramer.

The witness adds, that having had considerable opportunities of knowing the family of Pergami, has always heard it esteemed as one of the most respectable. The mother, Donna Livia, was of the noble family of Foreste. After the sale of the estate for the debts, there remained for the family the dower of the mother. Bartolomeo then entered the army as a conscript, and having serve several other offices, he was employed as Inspector of the Duties in the city of Monza, and then became the courier of Count Pino, who was Grand Captain of the Guard of Napoleon, and General of Division in the Army of Italy. On the arrival of the Princess in Italy, Bartolomeo was recommended to her by General Bellegarde, the then Governor of Milan, or by the Marquis Ghisilieri, also n ember of the Government of Milan, but do not know which. Witness went frequently to visit the Princess at the Barona and Villa d'Este.

Witness lived nearly two years in the same house with the Queen, dining at the same table, i. e. from the end of 1818, till she went to London.

Accompanied her to Rome, and in her excursion to different places during the time, and always observed her to conduct herself in the most proper and correct manner; and that when she rode she always wore long pantaloons, or a dress down to her feet.

Ready to depose to the falsehood of all that is said against the Queen, and the impossibility that, if true, he who was present, should not have seen it.

(No. II.)

CERTIFICATE OF GENERAL AND COLONEL GENERALI (COLONELLO) VEANI

States that Bartholomew Pergami, of Crema, was an *Hussar*, in the first regiment commanded by him, and served in the same some years, until the end of the year 1802. That at the end of that year he obtained his discharge. That during the time of his service in that corps, he always conducted himself as a good, valiant, intrepid, exact, and obedient soldier. Dated at Milan, 2nd October, 1810; and signed Veani, with the usual formalities of authenticity.

(No. III.)

CERTIFICATE OF GENERAL GALEMBERTI, HEAD OF THE STAFF OF THE FIRST MILITARY DIVISION.

States that Bartholomew Pergami served several years as Volunteer in the 1st regiment of Italian Hussars, in which the General commanded a division; that he obtained his discharge at the end of the year 1802. That during his service in this corps, he conducted himself to the great satisfaction of his commanding officers, both in his duty as a soldier, and in his private conduct. Dated at Milan, 12th October 1811; signed Galamberti, with the usual formalities of authenticity.

(No. IV.)

DEPOSITION OF LODOGARIO PERSICO, M.D. AND VETERINARY SURGEON IN THE SERVICE OF HER MAJESTY, AT PESARO.

States that having received his appointment in her Majesty's service, previous to his leaving Milan in 1818, where he had been

employed in the Military Hospital; on the 6th of June in that year he was accosted at Milan, in the street Botta Nuto, by a person of the name of Rastelli, then unknown to him, who asked him if he was not going to Pesaro into the service of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, saying my name is Rastelli, and I have been there in her service as Head Groom in the stables, but through some false accusation I was obliged to come away. You will not find yourself very well satisfied; not on account of the Princess, who is a most excellent character, a most *exemplary* (onesta) good and reasonable lady, and deserves that one should carry water in one's ear for her, (che meriterebbe che se portasse l'acqua colle orecchie); to express how much she deserved to be served for her own goodness; but on account of the insubordination which you will find in the stable, for you will find the servants there will not obey your orders. Witness further deposes that he has never met, during his service in her Royal Highness's family, with such insubordination; that he was at the College of San Martino of Crema, with Signor Bartolomeo Pergami, for two years, witness being in the first class and Pergami in a much higher class; *that during the vacation Pergami was placed under a private tutor, the Rev. Gaetano Donati, by his father, in order not to interrupt the course of his studies; that he is of an ancient and most respectable* (civilissima) *family.*

(No. V.)

Official Valuation and Appraisements, shewing the Property which 1st, the father of Baron Pergami allotted to him and his two sisters in 1786, which, 2nd, he retained for himself; and which 3rd, he allotted to Signor Pantaleone Pergamo.

[1.]—1785—October 15th.

Appraisement and Division, in Three Portions, of all the real Property, both Entailed and Fee Simple, belonging to Sig. Francis Pergamo, Doctor of Physic, Father of Baron Bernardo Pergamo.

Entailed Property, Portion A, to Sig. Bernardo and Sisters, Wards, and Under Age.

			Lire.*
A house at Pianengo, inhabited by the farmer Nicco	..	..	8,000 0 0
Do. at Crema, near St. Savergnini	..	..	10,100 0 0
Do. do. near Canton della Polenta	..	..	1,400 0 0
Do. do. let on lease to Nocolino	..	..	1,450 0 0
Below Pianengo.		Valued at £	20950 0 0
A piece of land belonging to the house of the above Nicco. Perticles	2 23	600	1,775 0 0
A parcel do. called La Novella	51 7	600	30,775 0 0
Part of Prato Vecchio of the farmer Dente	14 19	450	6,656 5 0
A parcel of land called Campo Delli Oppi	23 15	400	9,450 0 0
Do. do. La Dirtesa	17 14	200	3,514 13 4
Do. do. Campetto Prato Vecchio	10 10	350	3,645 16 8
Do. of arable land	46 0	150	6,900 0 0
Do. of uncultivated land	18 0	40	720 0 0
Do. of land called Il Poisio	12 11	180	2,242 10 0
Do. do. La Luna	3 7	200	658 6 6
Do. do. La Binda	4 0	400	1,600 0 0
Do. do. Il Gerusalemme, below St. Maria della Croix	6 0	150	900 0 0
Pert.	210 10		89,789 11 6
Entailed Property in the Parish of St. Stefano.			
A parcel of land called Il Bel Ladro	36 4	420	15,190 0 0
Do. do. Lama, laying part on the east	17 3	200	3,424 3 5
Pert.	263 17		108,403 14 11
Fee Simple Property in the Parish of St. Stefano.			
Part of the above land, Cantacuccho, situated on the east	13 8.2	320	4,268 9 0
Total of the Portion A. to Sig. Bernardo and his Sisters. Pert.†	277 1.2		112,672 3 11

* Lire, Milanese, or Milan livres, are worth rather less than the French livre: and 33 Milan livres make a pound sterling.

† The proportion of the Italian pertica is to the English acre as follows, three perticas and $\frac{30}{100}$ are equal to one English acre.

(2.)—Portion B, to Signor Pietro Pergami.*

ENTAILED PROPERTY.				Lire.
A house at Pianengo inhabited by the bailiff Dente	.....	..		5,600 0 0
Do.....do.....do.....Calendo	.....	..		1,300 0 0
Part of a country house (Casa Padronale) at Pianengo, looking to the east and with the door on the middle lane	.....	..		6,300 0 0
A house in Crema, let on lease to Sig. Basinoni	.....	..		7,800 0 0
				21,600 0 0
Below Pianengo.			Valued at £.	
A piece of land belonging to the house of the above Dente	2 0		600	1,200 0 0
Do....do....to the south of Calendo's house, with the Ara Patronale in the east	1 20½		600	1,112 10 0
A parcel of land called Il Cozzone	27 7		500	13,645 16 8
Do.....do.....La Mola	16 17		400	6,683 6 8
Do.....do.....Il Pione	13 15		400	5,450 0 0
Do.....do.....Le Chiaviche	5 7		400	2,116 13 4
Do.....do.....Prato dell' Ocche	18 5		450	8,193 15 0
Do.....do.....Il Carmino	46 9		400	18,550 0 0
Do.....do.....Le Selve	19 12		200	3,900 0 0
Do.....do.....Il Musignaceo	24 13		170	4,172 1 8
Do.....do.....Il Cagialetto e Lametto	14 14		150	2,187 10 0
Do.....do.....La Torre di Sevio	18 8		200	3,666 13 4
Pert.	208 7½			91,878 6 8
Property in the Parish of St. Stefano.				
A parcel of land called Il Zambone	14 3		480	6,780 0 0
Do.....do.....Zama, part of it situated on the west	6 18		200	1,350 16 7
Do.....do.....Il Dossello	7 8		170	1,246 13 4
Do.....do.....Il Paretto, part of it situated on the East	18 19½		380	7,147 18 4
Pert.	255 8			108,403 14 11
Fee Simple Property in the Parish of St. Stefano.				
Part on the west of the lower Cantacuccho	15 19½		270	4,268 9 0
Total of the Portion B. to Sig. Peter Pergamo				
Pert.	271 3½			112,672 3 11

* The father of Bartolomeo Pergami.

(3.)—Portion C, to Signor Pantaleone Pergamo.

ENTAILED PROPERTY.				Lire.	
A small country-house, with adjoining habitations at Pianengo, called La Bergamina.....	.....	..	4,000	0	0
Part of the country-house, Casa Padronale, at Pianengo, laying on the west, with the entrance on the main road.....	....	..	9,300	0	0
A house in Crema, situate in the Corso, near St. Spirito.....	.....	..	6,800	0	0
		Valued at £.	20,100	0	0
Property below Pianengo.	Pertiche.				
A piece of land belonging to the above house Bergamina.....	3 4	600	1,900	0	0
Ditto, belonging to the above house Padronale, situated towards the west.....	1 3	600	675	0	0
A parcel of land, called the Lower Roviolo, in four squares, facing the south.....	61 4	450	27,525	0	0
A ditto, called the Upper Roviolo.....	23 6	400	9,306	0	0
A ditto, called Il Mojapane.....	22 6	400	8,900	0	0
A ditto, called La Caresola.....	9 0	500	4,500	0	0
A ditto, called Il Sopravalle.....	16 18	300	5,025	0	0
A ditto, called Il Ramello.....	5 18	265	1,523	15	0
A ditto, called Il Poisio, the Rocolo included.....	9 12½	..	2,500	0	0
A ditto, called La Lama.....	7 12	200	1,500	0	0
A ditto, called Lametto; called also Filoni	4 0	150	2,100	0	0
A ditto, called Li Geroni, in two squares..	17 15	20	352	10	0
A ditto, called Geroso Avidato.....	3 0	60	180	0	0
A ditto, called La Luna.....	7 14	200	1,516	13	4
A ditto, called Lametto, confining with the wood.....	2 0	140	280	0	0
A ditto, called La Torre di Serio.....	4 3	150	618	15	0
A ditto, called La Torre di Sevio, surnamed Fuga.....	4 11	200	891	13	4
	212 6½		89,388	6	8
Property in the Parish of St. Stefano.					
A parcel of land, called Li Pradelli alla Pesa	10 13	500	5,270	16	8
A ditto, called Spatto Vicino.....	.....	..	800	0	0
A ditto, called Paretto, partly situated on the west.....	34 1½	380	12,944	11	7
	256 21½		108,403	14	11
Fee Simple Property in the Parish of St. Stefano.					
Part of the Upper Cantacuccho, on the east	5 14 10	320	1,797	16	7
Ditto of the lower ditto,.....ditto.....	4 3 6	270	1,120	12	5
A parcel of land, called La Lametta, near Prato Vecchio.....	5 15	2 40	1,350	0	0
Total of the portion C, inherited by Signor Pantaleone Pergamo.....	272 6 4		112,672	3	11

N. B. It is hereby declared, that that part of the house *Padronale*, at Pianengo, which lays on the west side, and is made over to the portion C, is understood to include all the premises and appurtenances adjoining it, but on the express condition of a dead wall being raised to divide the portion B, so as to proceed from the *Crose a Monte*, which lays under the arch of the *piazza*, towards the *croce* of the South, and then passing through part of the piazza itself, on the East, to be brought as far as the *croce* at the end of the *Muradella;* and this wall, with respect to that of the two arches, must be completed as far as those arches themselves; and with respect to that which divides the *yard*, must be raised no less than five *braccia* from the ground: all this to be effected in the next spring.

(*Signed*) AGOSTINO RIBOLI,
Public Surveyor.

Documents, &c. demonstrating first that the Character and Conduct of many of the Witnesses, who were heard for the Bill of Pains and Penalties, were such as to destroy the validity of their Evidence. Secondly, that their having been tampered with and suborned additionally proved the invalidity of their testimony: and Thirdly, that many parts of the Evidence for the Bill were especially incorrect.

(No. I.)

(AS TO MAJOCCHI).

I, the undersigned, declare as the pure truth, that THEODORE MAJOCCHI, formerly servant in the house of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, was towards the end of the year 1813, in the service of his Excellency GENERAL COUNT PINO, in the capacity of *groom* under the other coachmen, and he was discharged because it was discovered, that whilst the equipages and horses of his Excellency travelled from Milan to Bologna, and from Bologna to Mantua, this man, being in the suite, used to pilfer in the places where they lodged in the various stations several effects; that is, candlesticks, copper utensils belonging to the kitchen, linen, &c. and used to hide them in the baggage of the General, which bore the public mark, and that from Mantua he forwarded them to Milan, directing them to his wife.

(*Signed*) LEONATI,
Lieutenant Colonel and Aid-de-Camp to his
Excellency GENERAL PINO.

(Here follow the usual formalities to authenticate.)

(No. II.)

(AS TO MAJOCCHI.)

Milan, 14*th September* 1820.

I, PASQUALI MARELLI, hereby certify that I served with Theodore Majocchi in the campaign of 1813, and I attest that in the journey he would take whatever came in his way, even to the utensils of the kitchen, and put them in the baggage of His Excellency General Count Pino; these things consisted of towels, shovels, saucepans, all and every sort of linen. Once we were in an inn at Mantua, he wanted to take a silk dress; by using very great intreaties, I prevailed on him to leave it. He would even steal from me; he took from me once a waistcoat, and told every one I had sold it to him, the said Theodore.

For the pure love of truth, and by my own spontaneous act, not excited by any one, I have written the above, and am ready to maintain it by my own individual oath.

(*Signed*) PASQUALI MARELLI.

(No. III.)

(AS TO RASTELLI.)

THE undersigned attests, under tender of oath before any tribunal, that having been employed as tailor for the family of Her Majesty the Queen of England since the year 1817, when she transferred him to Caprile first and afterwards to Villa Vittoria. By this means he has known all the individuals who composed the court of Her said Royal Highness. He knew the outrider Rastelli, who, on an evening of the month of December 1817, if he do not mistake, it was about four or five months after he came to Caprile, that he called on witness requesting that he would accommodate him with a lodging for that night, having been dismissed from the service of Her Royal Highness, and got his portmanteau conveyed to me by John Diambrini. Witness found lodging for him in the house of one of his friends. As soon as he entered the house, he unloosed a leathern girdle

which he had round his waist, and began to count a large quantity of golden pieces. As he did not exactly know the value of these coins, which were louis-d'or, sovereigns, and Lisbon and Spanish pieces, he requested witness to count them for him. The amount of said coin was 750 dollars, of which witness has a very good recollection, not including some few dollars more which he had. Rastelli said he had gained all this money in buying forage for the stables of Her Majesty. He also regretted that he had not been able to make up his accounts with the steward, for which reason he had lost about fifty dollars. The undersigned asked him several times the reason of his departure all on a sudden, and he answered that he had had a dispute, without mentioning with whom; and tearing his hair, said, that he was obliged to depart. When he called on the undersigned, he requested of him a vettura (carriage,) for the village of Catolica, who fixed on the next morning for his departure with Giovanni Fiorani, the vetturino: but when, after having counted the money, he had returned home, and had gone to bed, he was awaked on a sudden from his sleep, without knowing who it was that called him, in order to go immediately to Rastelli, who wished instantly to set off, although it was not as yet day-break. In fact he set off before it was clear day, and witness was astonished at the precaution he took in closing the windows of the carriage in such a manner as that whoever met him on the road could not of course know him. On account of the hurry of his departure, and the shutting up of his portmanteau, he did not find room for a jacket of blue cloth with three rows of buttons, after the fashion of an huzzar's jacket, which he wore in the service of her Majesty; and then he asked witness to make him some present, as all tradesmen were accustomed to do to the servants of her Royal Highness. He offered to sell witness the jacket, which he refused, knowing that it belonged to her Majesty. However, he made him a present of two dollars, besides paying for his lodging.

After the departure of Rastelli, the courier, Charles and Peter, first coachmen to her Majesty, called on witness to know if he had seen Rastelli, who informed them of his departure, and they then said, that they had met him in the carriage with the blinds shut, and they regretted that they had not known it, as they

would have upbraided him with being a thief, because he had thus treated them when they were in want of forage for the stables of her Majesty.

(Signed) L. CRESTINI.

(No. IV.)

(AS TO RASTELLI AND SACCHINI.)

Pesaro, 29th September, 1820.

I, the undersigned, &c. &c. do depose, that for the space of two years nearly, I had the honour of serving her Majesty the Queen of England as Chief Veterinary Surgeon, and had under my care sixty-four or sixty-five horses. Some few days after I had entered upon my employment, a certain person named Rastelli, but of whose christian name I am ignorant, but who served her Majesty as Piqueur, made me certain proposals, shewing that he and I could easily gain a considerable sum by charging a higher price for the shoeing, and by entering a greater number of horse-shoes than was actually had; also by making an agreement with the druggist to increase the number of horse medicines, which could not be furnished without my order. I refused to consent to any of these proposals, and Rastelli was afraid to tempt me afterwards.

The above propositions, however, having let me know that he was a bad man, I sought to penetrate into all his actions more minutely, and by that means I found out, that if he could not make unlawful gains in the ways above-mentioned, he found out some other lucrative and equally unlawful gain, having discovered that very often he diminished the portions both of corn and hay for the horses, giving them very frequently more straw than hay, having seen him do this with my own eyes.

Some time having elapsed, I considered it my duty to acquaint the Baron PERGAMI, First Chamberlain of her Majesty, of all that I have deposed above, and I warned him also, that I had seen that Rastelli carried about him, round his body a large band of leather, in which he had a great deal of gold money,

which he shewed to me in my room; my wife Violante also being present; adding, that he expected to gain ever so much more, indeed, sufficient to retire from service and open a shop in Milan. In short, I know that the Baron, being at length well convinced of the bad qualities of Rastelli, turned him out of the service, and that he left at night for fear of being abused by the other servants; many of whom had before been suspected for his thefts. I knew likewise, at the court of her Majesty, Mr. SACCHINI employed in the stables, and for some time I considered him an honest man. I ceased, however, to have that opinion of him, when one day after he was turned off, but before he left his place, he expressed himself to me in threatening terms of her Majesty and the Baron, saying they were wicked people, and telling me expressly, that that very sword he held, should serve to revenge him upon her Majesty, since the Baron had accused him of a criminal intimacy with Mademoiselle DEMONT, for which, at least, according to what he told me, he was discharged.

These threats surprised me very much, because, before that, SACCHINI, on every occasion, had spoken with great respect, giving every good quality to her Majesty, as well as to the Baron. As, on the contrary, I was not surprised at hearing that he was discharged for his intimacy with DEMONT, having myself perceived their friendship and familiarity; on one occasion, particularly of some medicines that SACCHINI had ordered of me for DEMONT, and which in my presence he gave her.

(Signed) GIOVANNI ROSA.

(No. V.)

(AS TO RASTELLI.)

Milan, 15th October, 1820.

GAETANO CIOVII, Deponent, states, that in the year 1812 he entered the service of H. R. H., as Groom and Postillion, and that when he was afterwards advanced to Rastelli's situation of Head Groom in the stables, Rastelli having been made under piqueur (vice-piqueur); Rastelli said to deponent, on giving him the keys of the magazines, "Gaetano, to-

" know how to make a profit, and get something; at present the " magazines are full, but I shall soon buy some horse provender, " and I will give you a share of the profit: for example, when I " buy ten thousand weight of hay, we will put down twelve " thousand, and so on." On my replying, that I would not do this, and that it might be discovered, and we should be dismissed as thieves, he replied, that " I was a beast; that this was the " moment to make a profit;" and added, " if you did but know " how much I have gained this way!"—and so the discourse ended.

(No. VI.)

(RELATIVE TO THE VILLA RUFFINELLI.)

Declaration of ELISABETTA BRUNOT, wife of Jean Brunot, the agent or house-steward of Lucien Buonaparte for his villa of Ruffinelli, acting in the capacity of housekeeper. She remembers the Queen, then Princess of Wales, coming to the Villa Ruffinelli in the early part of June 1817. She had left before the feast of St. John, but she thinks the Queen was there at the feast of St Barnabas. The Queen came on a Sunday evening, and left Ruffinelli the following Saturday. An order had been sent by Lucien to prepare the house for the reception of the Queen, and she prepared accordingly. She remembers Signor PERGAMI arriving with the Queen. He was very ill, and went to bed immediately. Deponent attended him every day: he was confined to his bed until the day previous to the Queen's departure from Ruffinelli. She made Signor PERGAMI's bed every day, at different hours of the day, but always between the hours of nine o'clock in the morning and four in the afternoon; when she made the bed, he remained in the room, and deponent did not, on any one occasion, quit the room until PERGAMI was again in bed. She is confident that his bed was not warmed. She invariably remained in the room after making the bed till PERGAMI was again in it, and must have known if a warming-pan had been used. The weather was at that time (as usual at that season)

very hot, and the door of PERGAMI's chamber was kept constantly open, in order to cool the room. She remembers well the furniture in Pergami's room: it consisted of a sofa bed, on which he lay, a chest of drawers, a large round table, a toilette opening on the two sides, a night table, and some chairs; but she does not recollect how many, nor whether they were arm-chairs; but she has a distinct recollection that there was no sofa in the room, or what might have been taken for a sofa, beside that on which PERGAMI slept. The Queen went out every day with an Englishman and some others of her suite. She visited the Pope at Castel-Gandolfo; dined at a Cardinal's; and was always during the greater part of each day occupied in walking, riding, or with her suite. When the party left, the Queen left in one carriage, and PERGAMI in another.

(No. VII.)

(RELATIVE TO THE VILLA RUFFINELLI.)

JEAN BRUNOT, the husband of the preceding, is the agent at villa Ruffinelli; has been with Lucien Buonaparte about eighteen years. He remembers receiving an order from Lucien to prepare the villa for the reception of her Royal Highness. Recollects Signor Pergami coming with her Royal Highness; he was very ill, and went to bed soon after his arrival. The furniture in his room was, according to his recollection, as follows: a little sofa-bed on which Pergami slept, a chest of drawers, a large table, a night-chair, and a table of corresponding size, a little round table for breakfast, one or two arm-chairs, some chairs of straw, and some others of tapestry, to the number of six or eight. Witness has been in the Baron's chamber once or twice, but never saw a sofa, or any sofa-bed, except that on which Pergami lay. There was certainly none when the Queen came, and none when she went away. The Queen was at Ruffinelli in the month of June 1817, during the fete of St. Barnabas, and she remained six or seven days. When the Princess was about coming, witness was at Roica Priory, but he came to Ruffinelli some days before her arrival.

(No. VIII.)

SIGNOR MAESTRI, Physician of Trucati, attended a certain Baron, whom he believes to have been Pergami, at Ruffinelli, five days; bled him, he had a complaint in his chest, attended also with a fever; he never ordered his bed to be warmed; the weather was very hot, and it would have been absurd to have warmed his bed. The Princess came into Pergami's room he believes every day that he visited Pergami, but never until after his (the Doctor's) name had been announced, and then came in with others.

(No. IX.)

(DEPOSITION OF LUIGI MARZI, AS TO SACCHI.)

Pesaro, 17th October, 1820.

Witness states that he is a jeweller resident at Ancona, and that in the month of November 1817, having occasion to travel from Ancona to Leghorn, on account of his business, he engaged at Pesaro with a veturino, and that in the same carriage was another person, a stranger to him, who told him that his name was Antonio Sacchi, an equerry, then dismissed from the service of her Royal Highness. Witness having at that time heard several reports about the Princess, put a good many questions to him, through curiosity, about the Princess, and the individuals who composed her court. Witness recollects particularly that this discourse took place while he and Sacchi were walking the road side, having dismounted to warm their feet; and that a certain other person, named Signor Pietro, but whose sirname witness does not know, but, by his accent, appeared to be from Lombardy, and was travelling in a gig from the Villa Caprili, where he had been on a visit to Signor Pergami, who was also present. Witness deposes that in this conversation Sacchi made an eulogium on the Princess, but at the same time complained of the Signor Baron (Pergami,) to whom he manifested the most violent hatred. On this occasion, witness asked Sacchi if there was any improper intimacy between the Princess and Pergami,

who assured him that every report was calumnious, and that no one could know this better than himself, and that there was not absolutely any relation (relazione) between them that could give rise to the least suspicion.

Witness further deposes, that Sacchi, having found in discourse that the witness knew the Marchese Mosca, he intreated him, at his return, to beg her to interpose for him that he might be re-admitted in the Princess's service.

(No. X.)

(AS TO RASTELLI.)

Milan, September 1820.

PIETRO MAJERNA, son of the late Giuseppe, about fifty, native and inhabitant of the Barona; married, with three children. Without hope of gain, is ready to prove:

That in 1817, near St. Carlos's day, in October, at a fete given by the Princess of Wales, he was at Caprile, near Pesaro, a town of Romagna, and at her house, where he had gone on some employ, and remained there fifteen days, eating at the second table. Exactly on St. Carlos's day, Rastelli, *piquer*, or head of the stables, being in the stable, Sacchini, second equerry (*vece scudiere*,) came in and ordered him to move a certain saddle. Rastelli answered, he had orders to the contrary; upon which, Sacchini in a passion, gave Rastelli a blow with his fist in the stomach, and knocked him against the manger. Rastelli told the Baron of this in witness's presence, and the Princess coming out of a room, he thinks, must have heard it, but cannot be sure of it, as he retired instantly through respect. Towards the evening, Sacchini being in the pantry in a bad humour, began to bring up the adventure of the morning, complaining of one person receiving one order, and another a different one. He added, he would do any thing for the Princess, *were it to cost him his life, for she was a worthy lady, but that he could not suffer such disorder*. The butler, Rancati, hearing such expressions, said in derision, "I don't believe much of that," (non sara poi tanto,) on which, Sacchini looked at him, and continued

talking in the same way to witness, *saying at last, that he would go against an army for the Princess; and upon this, Rancati having said,* "That is not true," Sacchini said, he was offended at such an insult, and from one word to another, the conversation growing warm, gave Rancati a blow in the stomach, who being near the door which opened into the court, fell down into a gutter and was covered with mud. The Queen being told this matter, sent for witness to know how the case stood, and he tried to soften the business, saying, that it was done in a passion, and that Sacchini repented of it, and was ready to make excuses: but her Royal Highness said, Sacchini was a bad fellow if he had in one day struck two persons, and *that before going away, he had said he would cut some of their throats, so that she herself might be perhaps of the number.* Witness, however, does not remember his having used such expressions in his passion, although he did say something in French, which however he cannot assert to be the words mentioned by the Princess. Sacchini however, was dismissed and came to Milan; at the same time that witness left, Sacchini being in a carriage with some others, amongst whom was a young man of Pesaro, who, he thinks, is a jeweller, or a seller of coral, and witness himself travelled in a chaise with one seat (sediolo). It being very cold during part of the journey, they walked on foot, and Sacchini, talking with the young man of Pesaro in the presence of witness, *spoke in the highest terms of the Princess, and shewed he had hopes of returning into her service.*

Milan, Sept. 4, 1820.

Witness since adds as follows:

That whilst passing in the street Ne Rione di S. Francesco at Milan, about the month of April last, he found at the door of Signor Acerbi, Rastelli. They saluted each other, and witness, knowing he had been in Germany to get witnesses against the Queen of England, said, "Ah, you recruit for witnesses." He answered, "*No, I do not, I only serve those who give me orders and pay me, and I have nothing to say either against the Princess or Signor Bartolomeo Pergami; only I am sorry that they have dismissed me in a bad manner, and have ill-treated me;* but that is not their fault, but the fault of Luigi, the Queen's

equerry, and the Baron's brother." On the 22nd of June, 1820, at the public archive office at Milan near the great staircase, witness met *Rascanti*, who said, "Here I am, poor old man, without a pension, after the Princess has given one to all the rest." Witness answered, "You would come away, and it is your own fault if you have no pension." Upon which he said, "*Well, I have nothing to say against the Princess but there is something in the wind* (v' è in aria un affare), *I will make them know who I am.*" Shewing that his anger was more against her suite than against the Princess.

(No. XI.)

(As to Vimercati and the Commission at Milan to collect Evidence against the Queen.)

Milan, the 8th *September*, 1820.

Rosa Villa, wife of Giovitta Villa, native of Novarra in Sardinia, aged thirty-seven, innkeeper at Cenobbio, deposes, that some time before the Christmas of the year 1818, there came to her house at Cenobbio, one Antonio Mazzerini, who lives near Lugano, and who staid at the inn three days; on the third day he interrogated witness respecting the conduct of the Princess of Wales, asking what she did, and if she had seen the Princess, on the occasions of going to her house called the Villa d'Este, using any familiarities with the Signior Bartolomeo Pergami? or if she had heard any person say any thing about it, or from the servants or others? to which questions witness replied that she heard of nothing improper, nor seen any thing indecent; *to which he replied, that it appeared impossible that she had not seen or heard something.*

Further deposes, that on the 16th of June 1819, the said Mazzerini came again to witness's inn at Cenobbio, and told her she must go to Como, to the Angel Inn, to speak to a gentleman there, his friend, and that he wished witness also to go there. The next morning he renewed his instances; and in fact witness, through curiosity, resolved to go; but before going, he told her

he wished to have the boatmen who had served the Queen, and in fact, one of them named Joseph Guggiari, happening to come into the inn, witness shewed him to him; Mazzerini then took him up stairs, where he staid with him a good half hour; he afterwards came down and ordered breakfast, and made Guggiari call his biother Giovanni Guggiari, with whom he Mazzerini discoursed about the same time in an upper room. Witness afterwards went to Tavernolo, about half a mile from Cenobbio, to take a boat to cross the lake to Como, as she did not wish to be seen by the people of her parish going in a boat with a person she suspected to be a spy. While witness was going in the boat to Como, the gentleman whom witness went to see there, and whom she afterwards found to be the Advocate Vimercati, of Milan, having gone in a boat to Cenobbio, and not finding witness there, returned directly to Como. Witness went to the Angel Inn at Como, and there in an upper room found the Advocate Vimercati with another person, whom she heard named *Arganti* or *Riganti;* on seeing witness, Vimercati made Riganti retire, and only witness and Mazzerini remained. When Vimercati, rubbing his hands as if through pleasure, (fricandosi le mani come per allegria) "oh, he said, here is La Giovitta, you will know something of the Princess of Wales, at least from the servants, and you will have seen something sometimes in going to the house; you will have seen her ride in the small chair, or Padovanello (Berocino) and sit upon the Baron Pergami's lap; that she would have seen the Princess go out a riding on horseback or on an ass, and Pergami hold her on such occasions with his arm round her neck and the like." Witness answered, that she had seen nothing; Vimercati further asked her if she had heard from the servants of the house, if the Princess slept with the Baron, or if they slept near each other. To which questions, witness gave the same answer as before. He then told witness she did wrong in being silent, that she renounced her fortune, that she would have left off being an innkeeper, and that she would have gained more than by selling bottles of wine, and this business was a lottery ticket. ("Egli allora mi disse, che facevo male di tacere, che rinunziava mia fortuna, che avrei cessato di far l'ostessa, & che gua dagnava più che a vendere i boccali di vino e questo era un ambietto all lotto"). To which witness

replied it was nothing to her, that she had always been a poor woman, and would live as a poor woman, and that she would not do these things; (e di quelle cose li non le voglio fare). Then changing his countenance, and becoming serious, and beating in despite his hands upon the book, and telling witness she was a fool, he added, "well, you'll have to say it (that is the things said by him) without security," (senza cauzione); as if he meant to say, without gain, (come s'avrebbe a dire senza guadagnare niente).

When witness was going away, Vimercati looking at her more pleasantly, said to her, "since you won't tell me any thing, do me the pleasure so tell me what George knows;" to which witness, in order to get away, answered yes, yes, (si, si); and slapping the door after her went away in great haste.

This George had been a cook at the Princess's, both at Pesaro and the Villa d'Este, and is named Corticella.

Witness further deposes to the good character and conduct of the Princess, and her charity, and that various couriers came to her inn, among whom were one Joseph or Giuseppe, one Luigi Bianchi, and Rastelli, who were sent against the Queen to conduct witnesses; and all three solicited her to go to England; and among others, Bianchi, fifteen days before making this deposition, told her, that she betrayed her family by not going to depose, and told her this in the presence of her eldest daughter.

Witness adds, that the couriers who came to her inn for the above object, always took the witnesses up stairs, by which she does not know what they said to them. But Bianchi told her, "if you will go to England, you may say that your loss by leaving your house and affairs, would be 20 or 30 francs a day (lire); and if Vimercati gives you that, well and good, if not, you can return to your house."

Signed by the Deponent, after being read to her in the presence of the following witnesses.

CARLO LUTI DEGLI ANTALDI, and
PASQUALE LAGOMAGGIORE.

(No. XII.)

(AS TO BIANCHI.)

Milan, 23rd *October* 1820.

ANTONIO CAVAZZI, native and dwelling at Bologna, waiter at the inn of the Pellegrino, deposes, that being at Venice about the end of last year, where witness was then waiter at the Grande Europa, he was in company with one Giuseppe Garignani, his acquaintance, and also Pietri Valerio, and also Giuseppe Bianchi, the porter of the Gran Bretagna, who was known by them all; that, in drinking together, Bianchi took Giuseppe Garignani aside, three or four paces from the others, and said to him in a voice which they could hear:—"you who have been in "the service of the Princess of Wales, will be able to say some-"thing against the Princess, which will gain you at least 100 "louis." To which Garignani replied, he could say nothing against the Princess, and would not do such things. That, on this refusal of Garignani's, Bianchi said to him, in derision, "you are a fool (*minchione*)." That after staying about a quarter of an hour there, they went away, and on the road Garignani said to me and Valerio: "that fellow wanted me to depose against "the Princess, but I would not do such an action, nor could I "say any thing against her."

(No. XIII.)

(AS TO BIANCHI.)

The 4th October, 1820. *Venice.*

I, the undersigned P. VALERIO, declare to have heard, and that in the presence of Antonio Cavazzi of Bologna, that BIANCHI, porter of the hotel, called the Hotel of Great Britain,

said to Gius. Garignani, late valet of the Baron Pergami, who was then servant to the Prince Erco ani, and lodging at my inn of St. Moses in Venice; "You who have been, as you say, cameriere "or valet to Baron Pergami, and who say you have discharged "yourself for motives which obliged you so to do, must have "been able to know and see every thing that passed between the "Baron and the Princess of Wales, now Queen of England; if "then you will say that which I tell you, I will conduct you to "Milan, and there you shall depose, and they will make you a "present; and there will be to be gained at least 100 louis, "and then you will go to London, as I shall go, and our second "waiter is going too. Come, then, will you come? I know you "will be satisfied." I then heard that the valet of the Prince Ercolani replied, "Gius. Garignani, what would you have me go "and say? I could not say any thing, because I never saw any "thing that could be considered improper; so that if I should "say so, I should say and do as the other servants have done, "who were discharged for such serious faults; that some of "them deserved imprisonment, and seeing that they can no lon-"ger return to her Majesty's service, they take this expedient for "revenge, and perhaps as you say, for interest, and vent their "infinite wickedness, in diabolical imaginations which I could "never be capable of conceiving, much less saying; because a "man of honour should not allow gold or motives of unjust re-"venge, to make them say that which is not true, particularly "when it may be of such serious injury to one's fellow creatures; "and you will see the end of such liars, that if they are not "punished by justice in this world, they certainly will be so by "the justice of God."

This I can attest firmly and upon oath, as the pure truth, and will always say it, without having burdened my conscience.

(Signed) P. VALERIO of Venice.

(No. XIV.)

(AS TO THE GOLD CHAIN ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN PRESENTED TO PERGAMI BY THE QUEEN, DURING HER RESIDENCE AT VIENNA, AND TO HAVE BEEN PURCHASED OF ANDREA FANNA.

Translation of the Certificate of Fanna, the Jeweller.

Vienna, 21*st September* 1820.

I, the undersigned, do certify, that I never sold to her R. H. the Princess of Wales, any kind of chain during the time of her residence in Venice.

In testimony of which I have thus signed my name.

ANDREA FANNA.

(No. XV.)

(AS TO THE COMMISSION AT MILAN.)

DEPOSITION.

Milan, August 29, 1820.

CARLO CARMINE, son of the late Gottardo, native of St. Agatha, Sardinian State, in the Upper Novarese, aged thirty-three, painter, never was prosecuted, living at Milan, Agnello Street, No. 971.

Without hope of gain is ready to prove: that from the 1st of May 1818, he was at Villa Vittoria, near Pesaro, a Roman State, employed by the Princess of Wales, where he remained about three months and a half, to paint some rooms with two other painters, one named Serafino, and as for the other he only knows he was of Recaunati, as well as the first.

Having finished painting, Signor Pergami told him, that if he would put on a livery and remain in the Princess's service he would retain him there; and, in fact, he did so for more than

two years. He can safely declare, that during all this time, he saw no indecent act or freedom between the Princess and Pergami, who was generally called il Signor Barone.

As he was a painter, and the Princess was fond of painting, he was frequently called to her apartment for colours, and other commissions. And serving her as laquais two years, he was often called to receive her orders, but never saw any thing that could degrade her.

Deposes further, that on the 1st of August 1820, being at the coffee-house called Nazza, at Milan, a certain tall person, well dressed, and of a florid complexion, said to witness, "you have "been in the service of the Princess of Wales; if you have any "thing to say against her you may have five or six thousand "franks, and I myself will give them to you." To which witness answered, that he had nothing to say against the Princess.

(No. XVI.)

(AS TO SACCHI.)

Milan, September 23, 1820.

Deposition of SERAPHINO SIFRATORI, School-master, dwelling at Milan, states that, two years since; the end of September or of October, he was in the house of Sacchi, a tailor, in company with one Luigi Merli, and that Sacchi in their presence said:—"Now, I hope to finish soon my distress, as I have an "affair with Vimercati, relative to the Princess of Wales, so "that I shall get out of my distress." Witness deposes the occasion of his going to Sacchi's house, was to see a room which he had to let. Further deposes to drinking and smoking in Sacchi's company, with Merli at a coffee-house, at Milan, near the Porta Romana, and that on a question by Merli to Sacchi how matters went on (*come valla Sacchi,*) he replied, "well." Again, on Merli's saying to him, "where are you going?" Sacchi replied, "I am going for that affair of Vimercati's, who knows "when you will see me again." Merli then said, "Mind what "you do;" to which Sacchi replied, "what would you have me "do? I am desparate; I have no work; I will say what they "have told me to say."

(No. XVI.)

(AS TO SACCHI AND THE MILAN COMMISSION.)

Lodi, September 30, 1820.

Deposition of LUIGI MERLI states, that about two years since, in the beginning of October the witness, together with his friend, named Seraphino, was in the house of his (the witness') cousin, Gaetano Sacchi; and after some conversation, Sacchi, in answer to a question, how his affairs went on? replied, "that "they went on well, as he had received something from the "Advocate Vimercati, and should soon be out of his distress "(*miseria.*)" He further states, that witness afterwards was in company with Sacchi and Seraphino in a coffee-house, near Sacchi's house, drinking and smoking together, and on his asking him, "how the affairs of the Princess went on?" he answered, "I am "going to England; I am well paid." On witness asking him "what he went to do there? he answered, "that he went to do "that which the others did, and to say what they had told him to "say, *mi respose chè andava a fare quel che facevono gli altri e "dire quello chi gli avevano detto di dire*)."

(No. XVII.)

Milan, 29th September, 1820.

CAJRO PATRIZEO deposes that in the year 1818, in the autumn, he was met by the tailor, Sacchi, with whom deponent had worked, on the recommendation of deponent's relation Majochi; that Sacchi, after saluting him, said to him, "I have tried "several times to be re-admitted into the service of her Royal "Highness, but I have not yet been able to succeed. I will try "once more; then if they do not receive me, I know what I have "to do." He then asked me if we should act together?

Witness further deposes, that having worked with Sacchi, as a tailor, in the service of her Majesty, at the Villa d'Este, he never saw any thing improper, or on which he could have any thing to say against her Majesty.

(No. XIX.)

(AS TO RASTELLI, VIMERCATI, AND BIROLLO.)

Milan, 6th October, 1820.

FRANCESCO MANZONI, coppersmith, of Milan, was employed by the Princess to furnish her kitchen at the Barona and the Villa d'Este, states that he was acquainted with Giuseppe Rastelli at the time he was employed in the stables of Prince Eugene Beauharnois, and before witness knew him to be an ungrateful fellow and an impostor. That Rastelli came to him one day, on his having been dismissed from the Princess's service, to take his advice, and said to him that there was a process on foot against the Princess, and that the advocate, Vimercati, had the management or care of it (*ne avea l'assunto*); that they had interrogated some witnesses at Milan, and that they deposed horrible things, and that also he had been called to be examined; that they had given him to understand that there would be the means of gaining much, by making journies to seek for, and to conduct the witnesses who were absent. I advised him to accept the office of serving as a courier, advising to him, however, to mind well what he said in his deposition, as I observed in him a certain bad disposition (*certo livore*), not so much against the Princess as the family of Pergami, to revenge the injuries which he said he had received at Pesaro, when he was dismissed the service; he replied, that as his office was in the stables he could not depose any thing, not having ever seen what might take place in the apartments, and that he could not say any thing else than having seen the Princess speak to Pergami with much familiarity, and so he began his office of courier.

Witness further deposes to his having seen Rastelli *visit* Francesco Berto, formerly the cook in the Princess's service, to give evidence against her. Witness was also informed, by the keeper of the Emperor's stables, that one night two bricklayers, who were found asleep in a state of drunkenness, in the market-place, were arrested by the people, and, on being searched, money was found upon them, which, it seemed, they could not have gained by work; and on being interrogated by the people,

they answered they had had it from one Rastelli, in order to go and depose against the Princess of Wales, but that they did not know what they had to say.

No. XX.)

(AS TO RIGANTI.)

Milan, 18th October, 1820.

THE deposition of GIOVANNI DONARINI, native of, and innkeeper at the Barona, near to Milan, deposes, that he was in the habit, in going from the Barona to Milan, to stop at the shop of one Riganti, which is on the road, and who sold tobacco, and that he there occasionally took a glass of brandy; and on one occasion the said Riganti said to him, that if he had seen any thing pass between the Princess and Pergami, that is any amorous familiarities, kisses, or other things, he would have given him a handful of gold (Pugno d'oro,) and that he, witness, might have made his fortune; to which the witness answered, that he could not say any such things, as he had never seen them; that on the contrary, he had always observed the Princess deport herself decently; and witness, in order not to be further annoyed by his perfidious offers, ceased going to his shop; but, notwithstanding, twice afterwards, Riganti seeing witness pass, made the same demands, and repeated his offers.

(No. XXI.)

(AS TO VIMERCATI, AND THE MILAN COMMISSION.)

Cenobbio, 22nd Sptember, 1819.

I, THE undersigned, certify that, in the beginning of the present year, I was called and engaged by a certain Felix Porta, of Cenobbio, and François Cassina, of the commune of Piazza, to go to Milan, to the house of a certain Vimercati, (a lawyer) where they had examined other persons, and depose things against the honour of Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, and

the Baron Pergami; that is to say: if in the house (where I always was, in consequence of my employment) I had seen them embracing each other, or other scandalous things; that they would find me in every thing, and that they would send and fetch me in a carriage, and that they would give me two pieces (dollars) a day; and that I answered, that I had seen nothing, and that I would not go and depose falsehoods; and, in fact, I did not go, notwithstanding they came every day to solicit me to go, in telling me I should gain a considerable sum of money.

All this is the whole truth, and I am ready to declare it before any tribunal.

(Signed) PIETRO CASNATI.
ANTONIO AUGUSTINI, Witness.
GASPARO GUGGIARI, do.

No. XXII.)

(AS TO ROSSI.)

Villa d'Este, Aug. 18th, 1820.

CARLO CASNATI, son of Pietro, native and inhabitant of Cenobbio, aged twenty-four; weaver by trade; without hope of gain, is ready to prove:

That his father being a carpenter, attached to Villa d'Este, he had frequent occasions of going to the house daily, and never saw any thing to make him speak ill of the Princess.

In January 1819, or thereabout, being at Giovitta's inn at Cenobbio, he found there one Antony Rossi, of Lugano, a well-dressed man, who said to him, he must have a good deal to depose against the Princess, as he worked at her house; and, if he had, that it would make his fortune. He answered, he had seen nothing, and therefore could say nothing; and he said this, because he did not wish to make money by a falsehood.

All the country talks of those who are gone being gained by money: they are men of no character; and it is only since the searching for evidence that such bad things have been said of the Princess.

(No. XXIII.)

(As to the Conduct of the Queen at Barona.)

Milan, August 27th, 1820.

Deposition of Giuseppe Riva, son of the late Giovanni, native and inhabitant of Cassone, province of Como, aged thirty-three; married, two children; bricklayer; catholic.

Says, he was asked by Rastelli at Cassone, in the end of January 1819, when he came to collect witnesses to go to Milan, if he knew any thing that he could say against the Princess? He replied, no, that he only worked at the Barona, and not at the Villa, when the Princess was there, and that he had seen her frequently go out an airing, but never saw any thing improper; and therefore refused to go to Milan to depose against the Queen.

Has never heard any of the other bricklayers, including those five bricklayers who are gone to England to depose against the Queen, say any thing against the Queen, although he knows them; they are his friends, and he has worked with them. Does not know what they can have to say. Those who are gone to England are Ambrosio Bianchini, Domenica Brusa, Paolo Raggazzoni, Onorato Mina, and Enrico Bai.

Says, the Queen has always done good for the country.

(No. XXIV.)

(As to the Milan Commission.)

Villa d'Este, August 18th, 1820.

Giuseppe Buti, son of Antonio, native of Cavalusca, inhabitant of Massanico, aged thirty-eight, wooden shoemaker, without hope of gain, is ready to prove: That towards the end of September, 1819, having bought twelve poplar plants of Giuseppe dell' Orto, father-in-law of Antonio Tagliabue, he was in return to make some wooden-shoes, that being his profession,

and in the house of Tagliabue. About St. Martin's day, whilst he was working, there came one Giuseppe Ferrari, son of the late Giovanni Battista of Cenobbio, a paper-maker, and he told Tagliabue that a gentleman wanted to talk to him on the road; and he replied, "It is some Milanese about the business of the Princess." After about an hour and a half he returned, and whilst walking with deponent who carried a sack of flour, Tagliabue said that he was going to Milan again, but that he must not say any thing about it. After two or three days he left, and remained absent about three days, telling Buti to look after his house. On his return he said he had been to Vimercati's at Milan to plan some way of recruiting, *i. e.* to find people who would give evidence against the Princess; and on witness asking how they ever could find any thing against her, he replied, "With four stories one could get money." And at other times he said, that when he wanted money, he went to Vimercati's at Milan. He said that besides Vimercati, there were an English Colonel and a Secretary; that Vimercati, and sometimes the Colonel, who spoke good Italian, examined. He said too that they paid him, and gave him as much as he asked, and that they gave whatever he proposed to those he brought as witnesses. He said he once earned 200 francs in one journey, or convoy of witnesses.

A few days before leaving, Tagliabue said to deponent, in the shop of the shoemaker, Casanuova, that he was going to London, and that he was paid for several days, whether six or ten francs deponent knows not.

(No. XXV.)

(As to the Conduct of the Queen at the Villa Villani.)

Milan, August 23rd, 1820.

Pietro Franchi, son of Domenico, aged thirty-three; married, with two children, porter, inhabitant of Como, parish of St. Fedele, Fosso Street, No. 575.

Without hope of gain is ready to prove—That he served the Princess at Borgo Vico as porter, and saw her three or four times a week when he went to Villa Villani, but never saw her act otherwise than as a Princess. She was decently clothed, nor did he observe any freedoms between her and Signor Pergami, or any one else.

One Tagliabue, of Cenobbio, when they first began to talk of the Commission against the Princess, wanted him to go to depose against the Princess, and he could have got money by it; but, having nothing to say, he refused.

(No. XXVI.)

(As to the Conduct of the Queen at the Villa d'Este, and also as to the Milan Commission.)

Villa d'Este, August 18, 1820.

Marco Pelrasco, son of the late Carlo, native of the Corpi-Santi of Como; inhabitant of Como, in the road of arches (*dei portici,*) on the bank of the lake; aged fifty-one, married, dealer and chapman.

Without hope of gain is ready to prove, in further explanation of an attestation subjoined—That his house is on the road from Borgo Vico to Villa d'Este, and about six or seven hundred paces from the villa. When the road* from Guemello to Villa d'Este was began, her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales came almost every day to see the work, accompanied by a great suite; amongst others the curate of Cenobbio, Professor Volta and Configliachi; the then prefect of Como, Signor Tomassia, the canon Perli, and many others: and when the road was finished, the Princess came often to his house and the neighbourhood, making him give her water, of which there was a cool source near his house, and of which she drank. Whether accompanied by many persons, or by Signor Pergami alone, as sometimes happened, he (as he says in his attestation) never saw any

* Which was a road at the expence of the Queen, at the time of a scarcity in the district, and great distress.

equivocal conduct between them, but in both a decent and proper deportment, which he is ready to declare before any tribunal, home or foreign.

Those who depose against her, and whom she has benefited by so many alms, and by giving work to all the families around, can only speak falsehoods, and money alone can have made them invent such things; for they only began to be heard when people came to Cenobbio with money, to take the inhabitants there and elsewhere to the inn of Giovitta, at Cenobbio, where they invited them to go to Milan to depose, witness knows not what, but probably those calumnies now spread abroad.

He, too, about two months ago, was tempted to go to London to depose against the Princess. One of those who call themselves conductors of witnesses (*conduttori dei testimonj*) invited him to do so: he had a fat red face, was dressed in a blue surtout under a white great-coat, with courier's boots; and the people said he was the King's courier, but he does not know his name. He talked Tuscan (good Italian); but witness saw he did not know it well. He tempted him outside of the inn, saying, "I know you saw often the Princess of Wales, that she went "always near your house, and always with Signor Pergami: if "you will make a declaration of having always seen them "together, touching each other—" (*toccarsi*, using a metaphor, to make him say he had seen something wrong:) and thereupon he opened a variegated purse with a steel clasp, and told witness to take what he liked. He refused, saying, "You ought to be "ashamed to use such expressions to an honest man," and turned his back on him. This conversation was outside the inn. Some days after (he knows not precisely when,) the same came to Cenobbio with letters from those who were gone to England against the Queen; and as the papers said the King and Queen had accommodated matters, the conductor or courier being told of it, answered (as some say) that it was no such thing; and that, if any one wished to leave, he was come for that purpose. Some wrote from Holland, that they lived like lords, with their servant; and another (he knows not his name,) that they were afraid because they did not leave, and that they would be treated badly.

(No. XXVII.)

(AS TO PERJURY OF DEMONT.)

"*Society of Nobles of Milan.*"

"At the request of Signor Henry, Counsellor to her Majesty the Queen of England, the Directors of the "Society of Nobles of Milan" do certify, that it does not appear, from the registers and journals of the said Society, from its first establishment up to the present day, that her Majesty, during her residence in Italy, *ever made* application to be admitted as a member of the said "Society of Nobles."

Milan, at the palace of the "Society of Nobles," the 1st of November 1820.

(Signed) By the President-Director of the Establishment,

SAULE CONTE ALABIO,
MARCO BUCELLARY, Secretary,
CARLO LA GUERRA, Witness to the above Signatures.

(No. XXVIII)

(AS TO VARIOUS ALLEGATIONS MADE AGAINST THE QUEEN RELATIVE TO HER CONDUCT AT VILLA D'ESTE.)

Milan, Aug. 21, 1820.

GIOVANNA FERRERI, wife of Bartolomeo Negri, living at Cenobbio, provence of Como, has declared before Wenceslaus Cavaletti, son of the late Gaspare, lawyer and public notary at Milan, Santa Maria Falcorina Street, No. 2551, as follows:

She was employed at Villa d'Este to make the beds, sweep the rooms, wash, iron, &c. and never saw any thing indecent, or tending to compromise the Princess's character. About Christmas, 1818, a stranger came to her husband's house, and, on the

17th of January, two other strangers, who tried all they could to induce her and her husband to give evidence against the Queen; saying, "*He* must have seen the Princess bathe with Pergami "in the garden, and sit with him on the English sofa there, and "kiss him, and seen him put his hand in her bosom, and other "indecent freedoms (*scherzi*);" which her husband denied, and declared to be all false. They then addressed *her*, saying: "*She*, "as laundress, and having assisted to make the beds, must have "seen many indecencies, and signs of improper intercourse, "between the Princess and Pergami:" to all which witness replied, she had never seen any thing of the sort. These persons, on receiving such answers, said, with a view to induce her and her husband to depose falsely against the Queen, that, by not deposing to such effect, they would lose their fortune; that they would have made them a fine present; and as to the Queen, they would never be paid what was due to them for wages; and as she would never return to this country (Italy) that they would never receive any payment or advantage.

Witness, disgusted at this, said, that rather than depose falsely, she would beg her bread; that they were paid for their service; and that, if any thing was due, they were not afraid of losing it.

The last two who came on this errand threatened them with a letter from the police, to compel them to go to Milan to give evidence: to which her husband replied, if he had received a letter from the police, he would immediately have obeyed it.

Some time after, going out of church at Cenobbio, where she had been at mass, a young woman belonging to the inn there accompanied her, and asked, whether she and her husband were to go to Milan? Witness answered, when it suited or pleased her (witness), but not on such a business as the other seemed to understand; and that she would not depose falsehoods, as many others had done, and still do. Thus saying, they arrived at the door of the inn, whence came out a person not so well dressed as the former collectors of evidence, and said to witness, "Come, and take a glass of wine with me; I have sent for you often, but you would never come." She said she was not a person to drink at an inn, even with her husband, much less with a stranger; and he replied, she made great difficulties to say what so

many others had already said against the Princess. Witness answered sharply, that she would not speak falsehoods; and that she had never seen any but miserable wretches (*mangia tocchi*) depose falsehoods; and then turned her back on him.

(No. XXIX.)

(As to Evidence of Gargulo, and as to contract of the Hire of the Polacca).

By the present private agreement (which is to be considered by the parties in every respect as binding as if so rendered by the formalities of law) is declared as follows:

Captain Anthony Isouard, of the ship l'Industria, carrying the English flag, now in quarantine in this port, of about 340 tons, agrees to charter the above vessel to her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, on the following terms.

1st. The Captain will be answerable for the vessel being perfectly sea-worthy, equipped with every possible precaution, carrying six-pounders, with a crew of twenty persons, and fit to proceed to any quarter of the globe.

2d. The Captain engages his vessel to her Royal Highness for a whole year, from the first Michaelmas next, to the latter end of February 1817, viz. six months for a certainty, and the other six months left to the option of her Royal Highness, with the obligation of giving warning a month before the expiration of the first six months, and for the other six months, as part of them, extend the obligatory engagement from two months to two months.

3d. The said Captain will hold at the disposal of her Royal Highness, and for her exclusive use *the hold* of the ship, keeping only possession of such part of the prow as is necessary for the use of the Captain, crew, and of the rigging.

4th. The Captain will consent to every alteration being made in the internal rooms of the vessel as may be suggested by her Royal Highness.

5th. During the time of this charter the Captain is bound to

be always in readiness to proceed wherever, and whenever, suits her Royal Highness.

6th. The freight is fixed at 750 Spanish dollars per month, without primage, to be paid before hand every three months, the Captain giving a receipt for the first three months for 2,250 dollars, an equal sum being due for the other three months on the 1st June 1816, and made payable to Signor Giuseppe Galatti, of Messina, named by the Captain as his agent; and the optionary term of the next six months to be paid also before hand every two months; her Royal Highness having authorized Messrs. Mendham, Cailler, and Co. to guarantee the payments.

7th. The Captain will receive in his vessel whatever goods shall please her Royal Highness to order on board, and unload the same in whatever port or place her Royal Highness may direct him.

8th. Her Royal Highness engages to pay all port and quarantine charges, and Consul's fees; and the Captain is only bound to pay the pilotage.

9th. It is left to the option of her Royal Highness to order on board the Polacca whomsoever she pleases to employ in the alterations which she may require.

10th. All the other expenses of the vessel to be defrayed by the Captain, those of the goods by her Royal Highness. Two copies are made of this agreement for the mutual security of the parties, and it is to stand good as much as any public contract.

11th. It is further declared that in the above-mentioned rate of freight, the primage must be understood to be included, and it must be considered as a gift, and not as an obligation, any compliment which her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales might think proper to make to the Captain.

12th. Finally, the crew must keep perfectly clean every part of the vessel, particularly the rooms of her Royal Highness and suite, and be bound to render them every service and assistance.

(Signed) ANTHONY ISOUARD.

Messina, 19th Feb. 1810.

(No. XXX.)

Evidence of Gargiulo, as to where he stated that he was promised by Pergami a present of 6000 dollars, although he makes no mention of it in this letter to Pergami, written after the voyage, nor in the succeeding account.

Most Honourable Sir,

Her Royal Highness having condescended to give me a letter for Mr. Gibbs, in order to recover from him the expenses due to me on my vessel, and which I have occasion for in this town, on my arrival here I immediately delivered the said letter; but on Mr. Gibbs opening it, seeing that the signature of her Royal Highness was wanting, he made some difficulties and applied to the British Consul to ascertain the identity of the hand writing; and the Consul, besides satisfying him on that head, lent us every assistance, so that of 962 livres claimed in conformity to the first account presented, and in which the fees of the British Consul were included, at present only 338 livres remain to be paid me for actual expenses incurred as per the annexed account, signed by the Consul of the Two Sicilies. But after delaying my departure three days, Mr. Gibbs declined discharging this small sum. Your Excellency is aware of the expense attending the demurrage of my vessel, therefore I shall feel obliged by your sending directions to pay the amount into the hands of Mr. Jonas Hargherman, who will remit me the same to Naples; and, confident of your benevolent assistance, I wish you every happiness, and with all the due devotion, humility, and respect, I kiss your hands.

Your most humble and devoted Servant,

(*Signed*) VINCENZO GARGIULO DI SERAFINO.

(P. T. O.)

Genoa, 5th Oct. 1810.

M. Signior Cavaliere Barone, Calonello Pergami, Equary.

(No. XXXI.)

Account referred to in the preceding Letter.

Account of the expenses due to Vincenzo Gargiulo, Master of the Neapolitan Polacre, called L'Assunzione della B. V.

	Livers	Genoa.
Tonnage	169	2
Measure of do	8	0
Patent	19	0
Manifest of entry, inwards	10	10
Do....of .....outwards	1	0
Fees of *Lotrua*	0	6
Consul's fees	26	0
Certificate, and other expenses	104	0
Office of Marine	0	8
Total livres	338	6

(Signed) PIETRO BENVENUTO,
(Vice Consul.)

Genoa, 28th Oct. 1816.

(No. XXXII.)

AS TO THE TESTIMONY OF BIROLLO, TO THE GENERAL CONDUCT OF THE QUEEN.

Kingdom of Venetian Lombardy.

Milan, 16th September, 1820.

Personally appeared before me WENCESLAUS CAVALETTI, Notary of this city, and the under-signed witness:

PHILIP BOZZI, son of the late Frances;
GHETANO GHEZZI, son of the late Philip; and
GIOVANNI BIANCHI, son of the late Tomaso;

all three domiciliated at Milan: and who, being duly sworn by me, depose as follows: That Frances Birollo, a Piedmontese, and formerly under-cook to General Pino, having gone to the house of the said General to sell some wine of Asti, in the winter of the year 1819, on that occasion, and in the presence of these three deponents, spontaneously declared, that in the course of two years that he was in the service of her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, as cook, he had never seen any thing on the part of the Princess, or of Signor Pergami, or any of the suite, indecent, or not befitting the rank or the respect due to the Princess. He further declared, that her Royal Highness always maintained a proper demeanor and reserve, but, at the same time, joined with affability; as he continually had occasion to see her, and many times received orders from her respecting the table: and added, that all those who deposed to the contrary were blackguards (*birbante.*)

The above-mentioned three deponents further say, that, on other occasions, the said Birallo has said to them, that he could say nothing to the prejudice of the reputation of the Princess; and always repeated, that those who deposed against the Princess were blackguards.

Signed, in the presence of ANTONIO TOMAZZI, a witness, and the above Notary.

(No. XXXIII.)

COPY OF THE LETTER FROM ANGELINO DRAGONI, TO H. R. H. THE PRINCESS OF WALES, CONTAINING AN ACCOUNT OF THE OFFERS MADE TO HIM BY RASTELLI.

Milan, October, 1819.

Your Royal Highness:

JOSEPH RASTELLI, who was employed in the stables of your Royal Highness, is the person who, since the year 1818 last up to the summer of this year, was always after me to engage me in the number of the rascally party that is against your Royal

Highness; having offered me considerable sums from ths English Colonel Browne: and lately he offered me £4,000, to recompense me for all that might be due to me, either for wages, or for any other sums that I might be creditor for, and also the wages of six years; knowing that your Royal Highness gives me 2,000 livres of Italy a year, as your procureur, or steward.

This is all I can depose, and of which I can take oath.

I am,
With the most profound esteem and respect,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) DRAGONI ANGELO.

(No. XXXIV.)

COPY OF A LETTER FROM RAGIONATO ACERBI TO HIS SON-IN-LAW ANGIOLINO DRAGONI.

Milan, 20th March, 1819.

My very dear Angiolino:

I am too persuaded of your honour; consequently all the solicitations that can be made to you by the English persons (already known,) to have your deposition against her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales, you ought never to consent. The Doctor Ciceri has not failed to come to my house, expressly to try to persuade me to engage you to allow yourself to be examined, as I have said above. I answered him, that I pitied them, because they did not know your character, or mine; and I answered him, that, notwithstanding all they could do, they could never succeed to draw from you such a deposition. This is all I can tell you, and am,

Your very affectionate Father-in-law,
RAGIONATO ANTONY ACERBI.*

* Steward of the Duke de Liti.

(No. XXXV.)

COPY OF A LETTER FROM POMPEO TO HIS BROTHER-IN-LAW ANGIOLINO DRAGONI.

Milan, 27th August, 1819.

My dear Brother-in-Law:

A certain person of my acquaintance has come very often to my house, soliciting me to engage you to put yourself in the opposite party to her Royal Highness, in assuring you the wages of four years as charge-d'affaires, and the acquittance of all the debts you may have with the persons of her family. I assured him that I would not meddle, knowing that such an action was not compatible with your honest character; that on the contrary, all steps on that head would be useless.

I warn you of it in order that you may regulate yourself accordingly, and

I beg you to believe me,
Your affectionate brother-in-law,
POMPEO ACERBI.

(No. XXXVI.)

(AS TO BARON OMPTEDA.)

London, 29th November, 1820.

I, THE undersigned, in witness of the truth, declare that the Baron Ompteda, Hanoverian Minister at Rome, whom I had not the honour of knowing, came to me the 4th of December 1818, (saving errors), in Pesaro, where I was Director of the Police; he became acquainted with me by means of persons whom I could not refuse. He asked me several questions respecting the conduct of the then Princess of Wales, there settled, and the character of the persons who approached, or who were about her person; my answers were according to truth, but not according to his wishes; he wished me to find him somebody who could

acquaint him with the internal management of her house; and he told me that to retain that person, or those persons, who might be able to give him some information respecting the individuals in Her Royal Highness's house, I might reckon upon one thousand louis being at my disposal. I merely let him know the difficulties in so doing; the little use I considered it would be, and refused any money whatever; informing him that if there were any persons who could tell, I would have pointed them out, and he might have agreed with them himself. He went away immediately after the conversation and would have my promise for a correspondence (*carteggio*) with him, which he himself began as soon as he arrived at Rome; but which he found useless, as I could only give him that information which every other person could have done. Notwithstanding all this, he would positively intrust me with a letter from Mademoiselle Demont, formerly in Her Royal Highness's service, to Mademoiselle Brunette, to be given secretly to this latter. I refused it under plea of insurmountable difficulties, and of compromising my character, but he again pressed me in some way or other to its delivery.

The almost sudden death of the Baron Ompteda, which happened shortly after his having written to me, delivered me from all this embarrassment, and the letter remained sealed, such as it was delivered to me; and I should never have made use of it, had not the circumstances since happened to the Queen of England, shewn me my duty.

It was only in February, 1820, that seeing this illustrious personage threatened with a prosecution, I thought I ought not to conceal from her that, perhaps, this letter might contain proofs of a conspiracy against her; and under the influence of honour, and the feeling that I ought to refuse nothing towards the triumph of truth, I went to Rome and delivered her the sealed letter, and promised her that in case of urgent necessity I would resign her the letter of Ompteda, and that she might depend upon me as a witness.

All this being the pure truth, I make no difficulty in ratifying the same before any one whomsoever, upon my oath.

LOUIS CHEVALIER BISCHI.

Evidence, &c. demonstrating that her Majesty during the Proceedings against her, experienced very great difficulty in procuring the attendance of Witnesses to this Country from States in AMITY *with his Majesty.*

(No. I.)

TRANSLATION OF THE ORIGINAL OF REFUSAL OF POLICE OF MILAN, TO GRANT PASSPORTS.

Demand.

Joseph Corticelli, of Cenobbio, asks for a passport to go to London, to appear there as a witness in favour of her Majesty the Queen of England, presenting for that purpose a written request from Mr. Henry, as the Agent of her Majesty, the said Queen.

Answer.

As soon as the applicant presents the original request of her Majesty the Queen, or at the least that of her Procureur (Procuratore) Mr. Brougham, the Member of Parliament, his application will be immediately complied with.

Milan, 25th August, 1820.

From the I. R. General Director of Police.

(Signed) By the Director General,

DE GOEHAUSEN, Aulic Councillor.

(No. II.)

TRANSLATION OF THE LETTER OF P. LAGOMAGGIORE, CONCERNING THE DIFFICULTY OF HIS OBTAINING PERMISSION TO COME OVER AS A WITNESS.

To MR. HENRY.

SIR,

It is with feelings of poignant regret that I have to inform you, that the Memorial which I presented to the Supreme Judicature since the 15th of September ultimo, in order to obtain permission to proceed to England as a witness on behalf of her Majesty the Queen, in compliance with your kind letter of the 9th of this month, has not yet been determined upon; and on a second Memorial, which, in consequence of Mr. Brougham's repeated intreaties, I presented even to the Tribunal of *Appello Generale* in Milan, was endorsed the following decree:

"Let the Memorial be returned to the applicant, in conformity "with the decree of the 11th instant, issued by the I. R. Tri- "bunal *d'Appello Generale;* and let it be declared to him, that "(in the expectation of the relative decision of the Senate *Lom-* "*bardo Veneto* of the Supreme Tribunal of Justice, to whom a "similar application was submitted by the said Tribunal of *Ap-* "*pello*) that his request cannot be complied with."

"Como, at the I. R. Tribunal of Prima Instanza,
9th, October 1820.

(Signed) "SANPIETO, Secretary."

From the delay which the Supreme Judicature interpose to their final answer (whatever it may be) to my application, as well as from the constant (*costante*) aversion which the public authorities themselves have repeatedly evinced on the subject, I cannot but infer, that they intend me to waste the useful moments before they grant the desired permission. I must add for your government, that I have annexed to my above-mentioned Memorial of the 15th of September, not only a copy of your letter of the 9th ditto, but also a declaration of a nephew of

mine, who offers to discharge my duties during my absence; so that the tribunal to which I belong would not be inconvenienced by it. I enclose you the original of my other application of the 2nd instant, the original Decree being endorsed on the same.

I avail myself with pleasure of this opportunity to convey to you the sentiments of my respect and esteem.

Your devoted obedient servant,

(Signed) PASQUALE LAGOMAGGIORE, qum. GIUSEPPE.

(No. III.)

COPY OF LETTER FROM JAMES BROUGHAM, ESQ. TO THE ABOVE.

Milan, 30th September, 1820.

Being charged by Her Majesty the Queen to procure the depositions of all those persons who may be useful in the process against Her Majesty, I beg to be informed whether it would suit you to proceed to London to that effect. In case of your being disposed to undertake this journey, I am happy to inform you that Lord Castlereagh has sent some communication to the Austrian Government, by which every difficulty to obtain your passport will be removed; and further, you will have nothing to fear as to losing your employment, whatever may be the time of your absence. I hope you will favour me with an answer; and in the mean time, I beg to convey to you the assurance of my regard.

(Signed) J. BROUGHAM.

(No. IV.)

TRANSLATION.

(TO THE HIGH TRIBUNAL D'APPELLO GENERALE IN MILAN.

Petition of PASQUALE LAGOMAGGIORE, in the employ of the I. R. Tribunal in Como; solicits an early answer to his Memorial, by which he applies for leave to go out of the Kingdom. Under date of 15th September ult. no. 7941.

MOST HIGH TRIBUNAL,

I have not yet received a final answer to my Memorial, submitted to this High Tribunal, since the 15th of September ult. at No. 7941; the object of which was to obtain leave of absence to proceed to London as a witness on behalf of her Majesty the Queen of England.

Now, upon my receiving fresh applications to that purpose (of which I beg leave to annex a copy,) I feel the necessity of renewing, by the present, my solicitations for a speedy answer to the above Memorial, whatever may be the decision which the wisdom of this High Tribunal thinks proper to adopt. Agreeably to the annexed copy, Mr. Brougham assures me that the I. R. Government will have received the necessary instructions from the Court at Vienna, so that I shall have nothing to fear as to the continuance of my employment, which though not very profitable, I should like to preserve; it is therefore with this view thst I intreat this I. R. *d'Appello Generale* to return an early answer, that I may be able to give a final answer myself to the respectable English gentlemen who have so kindly renewed their applications. Mr. Cipriano Barisone, of your place, is authorized to receive for me the above mentioned Memorial, as soon as it is honoured by the relative *Decree*.

I am, with due submission,

(Signed) PASQUALE LAGOMAGGIORE,

employed by the I. R. Tribunal of Como.

Como, 2nd Oct. 1820.

(No. V.)

Translation of the Engineer Signor RATTI'S Answer to Mr. Jas. Brougham, stating that he was not able to obtain the consent of the Superior in those Departments he was engaged in, to come over as a Witness.

Milan, October, 1820.

SIR,

Upon the receipt of your esteemed letter, by which you request me to proceed to England for the sake of truth, and

and as a witness in the cause of her Majesty the Queen, I lost no time in asking my Superiors leave to be absent from the office I belong to, for the necessary time; but in consequence of some important and urgent business, confided entirely to my management, they have formally ("par des décrets") refused to grant the permission I had solicited.

It is their refusal only which, to my great chagrin, prevents my complying with your request: but any service which in any other way I can render to her Majesty the Queen of England, I shall consider as a sacred duty incumbent upon me, entertaining the most sincere sentiments of esteem and veneration towards her Majesty.

I avail myself of this opportunity to assure you that I am, with the greatest respect,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) ING. ARCHITETTO GAETANO RATTI.

A Monsieur Mons. Jas. Brougham.

(No. VI.)

TRANSLATION OF MR. BROUGHAM'S LETTER TO THE REV. DOM. GIOVANNI OSTINELLI, CURATE OF CENOBBIO.

Milan, 17th Oct. 1820.

SIR,

Having learned that the High Police of Milan, caused one of their clerks to subject you to an examination, for having furnished a certificate on behalf of her Majesty the Queen of England, I shall feel obliged by your informing me, whether you would have the above certificate returned, in order to add to it some new particulars; or whether you wish to withdraw it altogether? for in either case, I shall direct its being sent back from London.

Please to accept the true sentiments of my regard.

(Signed) JAS. BROUGHAM.

(No. VII.)

TRANSLATION OF THE REV. DOM. GIOVANNI OSTINELLI'S REPLY TO MR. JAMES BROUGHAM.

Cenobbio, Oct. 18, 1820.

SIR,

Although the circumstance alluded to by your letter of yesterday (concerning the examination) is correct, still whatever is stated in my certificate will always hold good, for it contains nothing but the truth. I do not think it necessary to make any addition to the same; nor do I wish to withdraw it from London; for I fear nothing, when I stand forth in support of truth. However, were you, or any one else, to consider my said certificate of no use whatever, it may be destroyed or consigned to the flames.

I feel pleasure in offering you my warmest regard.

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) GIO. M. OSTINELLI, Curate.

(No. VIII.)

LETTER FROM THE CURATE OF THE BARONA TO MR. FYSON.

Barona, Oct. 25, 1820.

SIR,

Desired, by your esteemed favour of the 21st instant, to give an answer to the request made to me to go to London, I have the honour to inform you, that I have addressed myself to the Archbishop my pastor, respectfully laying before him the letter, and leaving myself, as in duty bound, to his entire guidance. In pursuance of which he has declared to me, that, on account of various important motives, he could not consent to my going, and that likewise the circumstance of my great age, appeared to him to render so long a journey improper.

Thus, as I depend entirely on the will of the said Archbishop, to which I have always conformed with implicit obedience, I cannot dispose of myself without his formal consent and even command, as well as that of the Imperial Government, as I have already deposed to the Advocate Codazzi. I am at this moment interrupted by pastoral duties, which make me in haste subscribe myself, with the utmost esteem,

Your most devoted servant,

(Signed) GIUSEPPE GANDINI,
Parish Priest of the Barona.

(No. IX.)

DECLARATION OF COUNT PUPPI AS TO HIS DIFFICULTY IN OBTAINING A PASSPORT.

London, the 27th January, 1821.

I, the undersigned, declare as follows:—That having taken the plan of the apartments in the Great Inn at Trieste (the place of my domicile), in conformity to the request of Mr. Henry, Counsellor to her Majesty the Queen of England, I went on the 27th of last September to the Police in that City, to obtain a regular passport for appearing personally in London, to swear, if necessary, to the truth and exactness of my plan; but I could not obtain the passport any further than to Milan, because the Police at Trieste had not received the necessary instructions from Vienna; and on this account, when I arrived at Milan, with the Advocate Codazzi, I presented myself there to the Government, to have the necessary passport direct for London, but was obliged to wait for it several days, by which I have to regret having arrived in this city, just as the Parliament was going to close, and there was no occasion to examine me.

(Signed) GIOVANNI BATTISTA COUNT PUPPI,
Public Engineer and Civil Architect,
residing in Trieste.

(No. X.)

LOMBARD VENETIAN KINGDOM.

BY ORDER OF THE I. R. CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL OF MILAN.

The Advocate Signor Don Peter Codazzi, residing in the street of St. Vittore al Teatro, No. 2521, in Milan, is hereby informed, that in consequence of his Memorial of the 31st July, at the above number, instituting a process against Bonfilio Omati, for his having stolen some papers of his correspondence, as Solicitor of Her Majesty the Queen of England, the above-mentioned Tribunal has enacted the following

DECREE.

"That the fact in question, which is stated as a crime, and "the papers, and every thing else relating to the process, must "be submitted to the *Giudicatura Politica*, for the examination "and sentence, as far as the above fact falls under their cog- "nizance."

And this is communicated to the said Advocate Codazzi, for his guidance.

And the intimation of the present will be given full credit to, upon the report of any public officer.

Milan, at the I. R. Criminal Tribunal, this 11th of August, 1820.

(Signed) DELLA PORTA, President.
SORMANI, Secretary.

Authenticated by ZUCCHI, Sped.

To the Advocate Don Peter Codazzi,
St. Vittoria al Teatro, No. 2521.
Milan, this 16th September, 1820.

The above has been served by order of the Imperial Royal Criminal Tribunal, on the undersigned.

(Signed) Advocate CODAZZI.

(No. XI.)

The High Imperial Royal Criminal Tribunal of this city, on the 16th of August last, with their note No. 4186, have referred for examination and sentence, as far as it fell within the province of this I. R. *Giudicatura Politica*, a process instituted by the Advocate Codazzi, against Bonfiglio Omati, for having stolen some papers concerning the affairs of her Majesty the Queen of England, and entrusted to the said Advocate as her Majesty's Solicitor, but which the said Bonfiglio carried over to the Advocate Vimercati.

The judgment of the above *Judicature* on the process in question, as well as the previous acts of the above mentioned I. R. Criminal Tribunal, remain as yet in suspence.

This we certify in answer to the petition regularly presented yesterday to this Tribunal, No. 3666, by the above-mentioned Advocate Codazzi.

Milan, at the I. R. *Giudicatura Politica*, the 12th September, 1820.

The Counsellor Director,

(Signed) MANGIAROTTIA SPELLA, *Secretary*.

Milan, the 13th September, 1820.

Printed by J. Haddon, Tabernacle-Walk.